पुण्यपत्तनविद्यापीठपुरस्कृता संस्कृत-प्राकृत-ग्रन्थमाला
प्रथमो ग्रन्थः

रामानुजविरचितं

श्रीभाष्यम्

सर परशुरामभाऊ-महाविद्यालयस्य भूतपूर्वप्राचार्येण
भाण्डारकर-प्राच्य-विद्या-संशोधनमन्दिरस्थसंशोधनविभागस्य भूतपूर्वाध्यक्षेण
कर्मारकरकुलावतंसेन दामोदरसूनुना रघुनाथशर्मणा
विरचितैराङ्ग्लभाषानुवादटिप्पण्यादिभिः समेतम्

२·३·१—४·४·२२—सूत्रात्मकस्तृतीयो विभागः



पुण्यपत्तनविद्यापीठाधिकृतैः
१८८६ शाके] [१९६४ खिस्ताब्दे
प्राकाश्यं नीतः

UNIVERSITY OF POONA SANSKRIT AND PRAKRIT SERIES
Volume I

Śrībhāṣya of Rāmānuja

edited
with a complete English Translation, Introduction,
Notes and Appendices

By

Raghunath Damodar Karmarkar

Ex-Principal, Sir Parashurambhau College, Poona;
Ex-Director, Post-Graduate and Research Department,
Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.

Part III

(comprising the *bhāṣya* on Sūtras from II. 3.1 to IV. 4.22)

POONA
1964

PREFACE

With the publication of Part III of 'Srībhāsya of Rāmānuja' the task entrusted to me by the University of Poona nearly ten years ago has been finished

In 1957, I was involved in a major accident, when a cyclist ran against me and managed to break my thigh-bone, which necessitated my stay at a hospital for one hundred days and an equal period at home afterwards, lying prostrate on the bed all the while However I survived all that and was able to walk soon afterwards with assistance, and after a couple of years became more or less normal and resumed my activities, perhaps even with increased vigour

I may be permitted to heave a sigh of relief, now that the 'Srībhāsya' in its complete form has been published.

It has been a source of great encouragement to me to find that my edition of 'Srībhāsya' has been of great use to students of Rāmānuja's Viśiṣṭādvaita I confess I am a Sankarite by inclination, but I hope that I have done no injustice to Rāmānuja consciously.

It has been suggested to me that an edition of the Sankara-bhāsya on the Brahmasūtras, on similar lines should be brought out by me I am accordingly engaged at present on the Sankara-bhāsya

I am greatly indebted to my M. A and Ph D students for the help given and suggestions made to make the edition serve better the requirements of the students and the general reader.

I am grateful to Padmabhūsana Prof R N Dandekar (Poona University) who suggested to me the pattern about the re-arrangement of the text, which has been found to be very useful Dr. Mrs Shilavati Oke, M A, Ph D (my colleague at the Bhandarkar Institute), Dr. Miss Sulochana Nachane M A Ph D (M S University of Baroda), and Miss Vimal Thakar M A. (Government of India fellow at the Bhandarkar institute) deserve special mention for help in various ways

Thanks are due to the authorities of the Aryabhushan Press, Poona, for the care with which they handled the job of printing this voluminous work

Bhandarkar O R Institute
Poona 4
May 1964

R. D *Karmarkar*

CONTENTS

Text and English Translation					**Notes**
	Adhyāya II, Pāda 3	Pages	Paras		Pages

द्वितीयाध्याये तृतीयः पादः।

न वियदश्रुतेः ॥ १ ॥

(अधिकरण १, सूत्राणि १–९)

[328] सांख्यादिवेदबाह्यतन्त्राणां न्यायाभासमूलतया विप्रतिषेधाच्चासामञ्जस्यमुक्तम्। इदानीं स्वपक्षस्य विप्रतिषेधादिदोषगन्धाभावख्यापनाय ब्रह्मकार्यतया, अभिमतचिदचिदात्मकप्रपञ्चस्य कार्यताप्रकारो विशोध्यते। तत्र वियदुत्पद्यते न वेति संशय्यते—

किं युक्तम्? न वियदुत्पद्यते, इति। कुतः? अश्रुतेः। संभावितस्य हि श्रवणसंभवः असंभावितस्य तु गगनकुसुमवियदुत्पत्त्यादेः शब्दाभिधेयत्वं न संभवति। न खलु निरवयवस्य सर्वगतस्याकाशस्यात्मन इवोत्पत्तिर्निरूपयितुं शक्यते।

अत एव च, उत्पत्त्यसंभवाच्छान्दोग्ये सृष्टिप्रकरणे तेजःप्रभृतीनामेवोत्पत्तिराम्नायते

'तदैक्षत बहु स्यां प्रजायेयेति। तत्तेजोऽसृजत' (छा. ६।२।३)

इति। तैत्तिरीयाथर्वणादिषु

Third Quarter of the Second Chapter

Not the Sky, on account of not being heard (mentioned in Śruti) ॥ 1 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 1, Sūtras 1-9)

[328] In the case of the systems outside the pale of the Vedas, Sāṅkhya and others, we mentioned the absurdity thereof, on account of the contradiction owing to their being based on fallacious reasoning. Now, in order to announce that our own view is untainted by the blemish of contradiction etc., in respect of the worldly existence constituted of sentient and non-sentient admitted as being the product of Brahman, is being held under scrutiny, the mode of its being the product. There, the doubt arises, viz.—Is the Sky originated or not?

What (is) proper? The Sky is not originated. Whence? There being no Śruti (passage endorsing that); for, there is the possibility of something that is possible, being heard. In the case of something impossible, the origination etc., of the sky-flower and the sky, there is no possibility of their being denoted by words. Not, indeed, is it possible to scrutinise the origination of the impartite all-pervading sky, as in the case of the Ātman.

For this very reason, on account of the origination being impossible, in the creation-chapter in the *Chāndogya*, is declared the origination of entities beginning with Tejas alone in (the passage)

'It reflected — May I be many, may I procreate. It created Light (Tejas)' (Chā. 6-2-3)

In the *Taittirīya* and the *Ātharvaṇa etc.*,

'तस्माद्वा एतस्मादात्मन आकाशः संभूतः' (तै. २।१)

'एतस्माज्जायते प्राणो मनः सर्वेन्द्रियाणि च ।
खं वायुर्ज्योतिरापः' (मु. २।१।३)

इत्यादिषु श्रूयमाणा वियदुत्पत्तिरर्थविरोधाद्बाध्यते, इति ॥ १ ॥

[329] एवं प्राप्ते, अभिधीयते—

अस्ति तु ॥ २ ॥

अस्ति त्वाकाशस्योत्पत्तिः। अतीन्द्रियार्थविषया हि श्रुतिः प्रमाणान्तराप्रतीतामपि वियदुत्पत्तिं प्रतिपादयितुं समर्थैव। न च श्रुतिप्रतिपन्नेऽर्थे तद्विरोधि निरवयवत्वादिहेतुकमनुत्पत्त्यनुमानमुदेतुमलम्। आत्मनोऽप्यनुत्पत्तिर्न निरवयवत्वप्रयुक्ता, इति वक्ष्यति ॥ २ ॥

[330] पुनश्चोदयति—

गौण्यसंभवाच्छब्दाच्च ॥ ३ ॥

'तस्माद्वा एतस्मादात्मन आकाशः संभूतः' (तै. २।१)

इत्यादिवियदुत्पत्तिश्रुतिर्गौणीति कल्पयितुं युक्तम्,

'तत्तेजोऽसृजत' (छा. ६।२।३)

'From that, verily, from this Ātman, the Ākāśa was originated' (Tai. 2·1)

'From this, are produced the Prāṇa, mind and the sense-organs, the sky, mind, light, waters' (Mu. 2.1.3)

the origination of the sky, declared in (the above passages) etc., is contradicted owing to the contradiction of the sense ॥ 1 ॥

[329] This (prima-facie view] being reached, it is stated (in reply)-

But there is ॥ 2 ॥

But there is the origination of Ākāśa; for, the Sruti dealing with supersensuous objects is certainly competent to propound the origination of the sky, although not comprehended from other means of proof. Not again, in a matter known from the Śruti, any inference opposed to it pointing to non-origination based upon the logical mark—being impartite etc., — is competent to rise up. The non-origination of the Ātman himself is not due to his being impartite, — this he (Sūtrakāra) would say further ॥ 2 ॥

[330] Again (the Pūrvapakṣin) raises an objection (pushes his point of view) —

(The origination-Śruti is) secondary, on account of the impossibility and on account of the word (Amṛta) ॥ 3 ॥

'From that, verily, from this Ātman, Ākāśa originated' (Tai. 2·1)

etc., — this Sruti describing the origination of the sky can be regarded as metaphorical (secondary), because it is not possible to, propound the origination of the sky, as in (the passage)

'It created Tejas' (Chā. 6·2·3)

इति सिसृक्षोर्ब्रह्मणः प्रथमं तेज उत्पद्यते, इति तेजउत्पत्तिप्राथम्येन वियदुत्पत्तिप्रतिपादनासंभवात् ।

'वायुश्चान्तरिक्षं चैतदमृतम्' (बृ. २।३।३)

इति वियतोऽमृतत्वशब्दाच्च ॥ ३ ॥

[331] कथमेकस्य संभूतशब्दस्याकाशापेक्षया गौणत्वम्, अग्न्याद्यपेक्षया मुख्यत्वम्? इति चेत्— तत्राह—

स्याच्चैकस्य ब्रह्मशब्दवत् ॥ ४ ॥

एकस्यैव

'तस्माद्वा एतस्मादात्मन आकाशः संभूतः' (तै. २।१)

इत्याकाशे मुख्यत्वासंभवात्, गौणतया प्रयुक्तस्य संभूतशब्दस्य

'वायोरग्निः' (तै. २।१)

इत्यादिष्वनुपक्तस्य मुख्यत्वं स्यादेव । ब्रह्मशब्दवत्— यथा ब्रह्मशब्दः

'तस्मादेतद्ब्रह्म नामरूपमन्नं च जायते' (मु. १।१।९)

इत्यत्र प्रधाने गौणतया प्रयुक्तः, तस्मिन्नेव प्रकरणे

'तपसा चीयते ब्रह्म ततोऽन्नमभिजायते' (मु. १।१।८)

इति ब्रह्मणि मुख्यतया प्रयुज्यते, तद्वत् । अनुषङ्गे च श्रवणावृत्ताविवाभिधानावृत्तिर्विद्यत एवेत्यर्थः ॥ ४ ॥

Tejas is originated first from Brahman desirous of creating, and so, as the origination of Tejas comes first, it is impossible to propound the origination of the sky, and because, Viyat (sky) is spoken of by the word Amṛta in

'Wind and the mid-region—this is immortal (Amṛta)'. (Br. 2·3·3)

॥ 3 ॥

[331] If it is argued —how in the case of the same word Sambhūta, there is a secondary nature in respect of Ākāśa, and a primary nature in, respect of Agni? —there says (the Sūtrakāra)—

There could be (different natures) in the case of one (and the same word), like the word Brahman ॥ 4 ॥

There would certainly be in the case of one and the same word Sambhūta, use in a secondary sense, owing to its primary sense being impossible in the case of Ākāśa in (the passage)—

'From that, verily, from this Ātman, Ākāśa was originated' (Tai. 2·1)

its primary sense being tacked on in (the passage)

'From Vayu, Agni' (Tai. 2·1)

etc., like the word Brahman. As the word Brahman used in a secondary sense to refer to Pradhāna in (the passage)—

'From that, this Brahman, name and form, and food, are originated' (Mu. 1·9·9)

is used in its primary sense in respect of Brahman in the same context—

'Brahman is augmented by penance, from that, food is produced' (Mu. 1·1·8)

— like that. — And in the case of what is tacked on, like repeated hearing, there does exist the repetition of the denotative. — this is the purport ॥ 4 ॥

परिहरति—

प्रतिज्ञाहानिरव्यतिरेकात् ॥ ५ ॥

[331A] छान्दोग्यश्रुत्यनुसारेणान्यासां वियदुत्पत्तिवादिनीनां श्रुतीनां गौणत्वं कल्पयितुं न युज्यते । यतश्छान्दोग्यश्रुत्यैव वियदुत्पत्तिरङ्गीकृता

'येनाश्रुतं श्रुतम्' (छा. ६।१।१)

इत्यादिना ब्रह्मज्ञानेन सर्वज्ञानप्रतिज्ञानात् । तस्या हि प्रतिज्ञाया अहानिराकाशस्यापि ब्रह्मकार्यत्वेन तदव्यतिरेकादेव भवति ॥ ५ ॥

शब्देभ्यः ॥ ६ ॥

इतश्च वियदुत्पत्तिश्छान्दोग्ये प्रतीयते—

'सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीदेकमेवाद्वितीयम्' (छा. ६।२।१)

इति प्राक्सृष्टेरेकत्वावधारणशब्दात्,

'ऐतदात्म्यमिदं सर्वम्' (छा. ६।८।७)

इत्येवमादिशब्देभ्यश्च कार्यत्वेन ब्रह्मणोऽव्यतिरेकप्रतीतेः । न च

'तत्तेजोऽसृजत' (छा. ६।२।३)

इति तेजस उत्पत्तिश्रुतिर्वियदुत्पत्तिं वारयति । वियदुत्पत्त्यवचनमात्रेण तेजसः प्रतीयमानं

(The Sūtrakāra) refutes—

Non-stultification of the solemn declaration, on account of that being not different ॥ 5 ॥

[331A] It is not proper to speak of, in conformity with the *Chāndogya* Śruti-passage, the metaphorical nature of other Śruti-passages declaring the origination of the sky; because by the *Chāndogya*-Śruti itself has been accepted the origination of the sky, on account of all knowledge arising from the knowledge of Brahman, in

'By what the unheard is heard' (Chā. 6·1·1)

etc., —the non-stultification of that solemn declaration can be there only on account of Ākāśa also not being different from that (Brahman), being the product of Brahman ॥ 5 ॥

(And) from the (Śruti) words ॥ 6 ॥

And thus is the origination of the sky apprehended from the *Chāndogya*, on account of the word definitely declaring oneness prior to creation in the passage,

'The existent alone, gentle one, this was in the beginning, one alone, without a second' (Chā. 6·2·1)

and on account of (the sky) being apprehended as not being different from Brahman, being a product, from the words (in the Śruti)

'All this has this as the Ātman'. (Chā. 6·8·7)

etc., Not again, does the Sruti mentioning the origination of Tejas

'It created Tejas' (Chā. 6·2·3)

ward off the *origination of the sky. The apprehension of Tejas* having the first place, merely because there is not the statement about the origination of

प्राथम्यं श्रुत्यन्तरप्रतिपन्नां वियदुत्पत्तिं न निवारयितुमलम् ॥ ६ ॥

यावद्विकारं तु विभागो लोकवत् ॥ ७ ॥

तुशब्दश्चार्थे ।

'ऐतदात्म्यमिदं सर्वम्' (छा. ६।८।७)

इत्यादिभिराकाशस्य विकारत्ववचनेन तस्याकाशस्य ब्रह्मणो विभागः, उत्पत्तिरप्युक्तैव। लोकवत्— यथा लोक एते सर्वे देवदत्तपुत्रा इत्यभिधाय तेषु केषांचित्तत उत्पत्तिवचनेन सर्वेषामुत्पत्तिरुक्ता स्यात, तद्वत्। एवं च सति

'वायुश्चान्तरिक्षं चैतदमृतम्' (बृ. २।३।३)

इति सुराणामिव चिरकालस्थायित्वाभिप्रायम् ॥ ७ ॥

एतेन मातरिश्वा व्याख्यातः ॥ ८ ॥

[332] अनेनैव हेतुना मातरिश्वनो वायोरप्युत्पत्तिर्व्याख्याता। वियन्मातरिश्वनोः पृथग्योगकरणं

'तेजोतस्तथा ह्याह' (ब्र. सू. २।३।१०)

इत्यत्र मातरिश्वपरामर्शार्थम् ॥ ८ ॥

असंभवस्तु सतोनुपपत्तेः ॥ ९ ॥

---

the sky, is not competent to set aside the origination of the sky apprehended from other Śrutis. ॥ 6 ॥

And owing to its being a modification, there is separateness: *as in popular parlance* ॥ 7 ॥

The word Tu has the sense of Ca (and). Owing to Ākāśa being spoken of as a modification in (the passage)

'*All this has this as the Ātman*' (Chā. 6·8·7)

etc, the separateness of that Ākāśa, from Brahman, the origination also has been spoken of that Ākāśa, Lokavat — as in popular parlance — having mentioned — all these are Devadatta's sons, — by the direct mention of some amongst them being born of him, the birth of all of them (from Devadatta) is as good as spoken — like that. And this being so, (the passage)

'*The wind, and the mid-region — this is immortal*' (Br. 2·3·3)

is intended to point out the stay for a long time as in the case of the gods. ॥ 7 ॥

By this, the Wind (also) is explained ॥ 8 ॥

[332] By this very argument, is explained the origination of Mātariśvan,— the Wind. The separate association of Viyat and Mātariśvan is for the sake of referring to (the Sūtra) —

'*The Tejas from this — To the same effect, says*' (Bra. Sū. II. 3·10)

॥ 8 ॥

But non-origination (only), of the existent (Brahman) on account of impossibility ॥ 9 ॥

तुशब्दोऽवधारणार्थः । असंभवः — अनुत्पत्तिः, सतो ब्रह्मण एव । तद्व्यतिरिक्तस्य कस्यचिदनुत्पत्तिर्न संभवति । एतदुक्तं भवति— वियन्मातरिश्वनोरुत्पत्तिप्रतिपादनमुदाहरणार्थम् । उत्पत्त्यसंभवस्तु सतः परमकारणस्य परस्यैव ब्रह्मणः । तद्व्यतिरिक्तस्य कृत्स्नस्याव्यक्तमहदहंकारतन्मात्रेन्द्रियवियत्पवनादिकस्य प्रपञ्चस्यैकविज्ञानेन सर्वविज्ञानप्रतिज्ञादिभिरवगतकार्यभावस्यानुत्पत्तिर्नोपपद्यत इति ॥ ९ ॥

वियदधिकरण समाप्तम् (१)

तेजोतस्तथा ह्याह ॥ १० ॥

(अधिकरण २, सूत्राणि १०—१७)

[333] ब्रह्मव्यतिरिक्तस्य कृत्स्नस्य ब्रह्मकार्यत्वमुक्तम् । इदानीं व्यवहितकार्याणां किं केवलात्तत्तदनन्तरकारणभूताद्वस्तुन उत्पत्तिः, आहोस्वित्तत्तद्रूपाद्ब्रह्मणः ? इति चिन्त्यते — किं युक्तम् ? केवलात्तत्तद्वस्तुन इति । कुतः ? तेजस्तावदतो मातरिश्वन एवोत्पद्यते ।

'*वायोरग्नि*' (तै २।१)

इति ह्याह ॥ १० ॥

आपः ॥ ११ ॥

आपोऽप्यतस्तेजस एवोत्पद्यन्ते ।

'*अग्नेराप*' (तै. २।१)

The word Tu is for the sake of emphasis Asambhava — non-origination — belongs to the existent Brahman alone Non-origination of anything apart from that is not possible This is what is intended to be said— The propounding of the origination of Sky and Wind is for the sake of giving an illustrative instance The impossibility of origination, however, belongs to the Highest Brahman alone that is existent and the original cause Non-origination is inappropriate in the case of everything other than that, such as the entire worldly existence, Avyakta (Unmanifest), Mahat, Ahamkāra, the subtle elements, sense-organs, Sky, Wind, etc, whose being the product is known by the solemn statement — the knowledge of everything by the knowledge of one, etc ॥ 9 ॥

Here ends the Viyadadhikarana (1)

The Tejas from this — To the same effect, says ॥ 10 ॥

(Adhikarana 2, Sūtras 10–17)

[333] Everything other than Brahman is stated to be the product of Brahman Now this is being considered — Is the production of the intermediate products from only the entities — the immediate causes of the various products — or from Brahman possessed of the various forms? What (is) proper? From merely the various objects — Whence? The Tejas, for the matter of that, is produced from this, Wind (The Sruti), indeed, says

'*From the Wind, Fire*' (Tai. 2 1)

॥ 10 ॥

The Waters ॥ 11 ॥

Waters also are produced from this Tejas alone (The Sruti) indeed says

'*From Fire, the Waters*' (Tai 2·1)

'तदपोऽसृजत' (छा. ६।२।३)

इत्याह ॥ ११ ॥

पृथिवी ॥ १२ ॥

पृथिव्यद्भ्यः उत्पद्यते ।

'अद्भ्य पृथिवी' (तै. २।१)

'ता अन्नमसृजन्त' (छा. ६।२।४)

इत्याह ॥ १२ ॥

[334] ननु, अन्नशब्देन कथं पृथिव्यभिधीयते ? अत आह—

अधिकाररूपशब्दान्तरेभ्यः ॥ १३ ॥

महाभूतसृष्ट्यधिकारात्पृथिव्येवान्नशब्देनोक्ता, इति प्रतीयते। अदनीयस्य सर्वस्य पृथिवीविकारत्वात्कारणे कार्यशब्दः। तथा वाक्यशेषे भूतानां रूपसंशब्दने

'यदग्ने रोहितं रूप तेजसस्तद्रूप यच्छुक्लं तदपां यत्कृष्णं तदन्नस्य' (छा. ६।४।१)

इति, अप्तेजसोः सजातीयमेवान्नशब्दवाच्यं प्रतीयते। शब्दान्तरं च समानप्रकरणे

'अग्नेरापः। अद्भ्यः पृथिवी' (तै. २।१)

इति श्रूयते। अतः, पृथिव्येवान्नशब्देनोच्यते, इत्यद्भ्य एव पृथिवी जायते। उदाहृतास्तेजः-

---

'That created the Waters' (Chā. ·2·3)

The Earth ॥ 12 ॥

The Earth is produced from the Waters.

'From the Waters, the Earth' (Tai.. 2·1)

'They (Waters) produced Food' (Chā. 6·2·4)

—so indeed says (the Śruti) ॥ 12 ॥

[334] I say (says the objector)—How is the Earth denoted by the word Anna? To this (the Sūtrakāra) says—

On account of the topic, colour and other words ॥ **13** ॥

That the Earth alone is mentioned by the word Anna is apprehended from the topic dealing with the creation of the great elements. Everything that is fit to be eaten is a modification of the earth, and so, the word denoting the effect is used to denote the cause. Similarly, in the concluding part of the passage describing the colour of the elements, it is apprehended that the sense of the word Anna is, verily, homogeneous with that of Waters and Tejas as in the passage

'What (is) the red colour of Fire, that (is) the colour of Tejas; what white, that of Waters; what dark, that of Anna (the Earth)' (Chā. 6·4·1)

—there are also other words in similar contexts— in the Śruti

'From Agni, Waters; from Waters, the Earth'. (Tai. 2·1)

Therefore, the Earth itself is spoken of by the word Anna, and so, the Earth is produced from Waters alone. The Tejas etc., that are cited are merely for

प्रभृतयः प्रदर्शनार्थाः। महदादयोऽपि हि स्वानन्तरवस्तुन एवोत्पद्यन्ते, यथाश्रुत्यभ्युपगमाविरोधात्।

'एतस्माज्जायते प्राणो मनः सर्वेन्द्रियाणि च।
खं वायुर्ज्योतिरापः पृथिवी विश्वस्य धारिणी॥' (मु. २।१।३)
'तस्मादेतद्ब्रह्म नामरूपमन्नं च जायते' (मु. १।१।९)
'तस्माद्वा एतस्मादात्मन आकाशः संभूतः' (तै २।१)
'तत्तेजोऽसृजत' (छा. ६।२।३)

इत्यादयो ब्रह्मणः परंपरया कारणत्वेऽप्युपपद्यन्त इति॥ १३॥

[335] एवं प्राप्ते, प्रचक्ष्महे--

तदभिध्यानादेव तु तल्लिङ्गात्सः॥ १४॥

तुशब्दात्पक्षो व्यावृत्तः। महदादिकार्याणामपि तत्तदनन्तरवस्तुशरीरकः स एव पुरुषोत्तमः कारणम्। कुतः? तदभिध्यानरूपात्तल्लिङ्गात्। अभिध्यानम्— 'बहु स्याम्' इति संकल्पः।

'तत्तेज ऐक्षत बहु स्यां प्रजायेयेति' (छा. ६।२।३)

---

the purpose of indication. Mahat and others also are, indeed, produced from entities alone immediately near to them, on account of the non-contradiction in understanding the Śruti passages as they are—

'*From this are produced Prāṇa, mind, and all sense-organs, the Sky, Wind, Light, Waters (and) the Earth, the support of all (the universe)*' (Mu. 2·1·3)

'*From that, is produced this Brahman, name and form and food*' (Mu. 1·1·9)

'*From that, verily, from this Ātman, Ākāśa originated*' (Tai. 2·1)

'*It created Tejas*' (Chā. 6·2·3)

—These (passages) etc., would be appropriate even if Brahman were to be (an indirect) cause in succession ॥ 13 ॥

[335] This (prima-facie view) being reached, we reply—

But on account of his reflection itself, he (the Ātman is the cause,) on account of the characteristic feature ॥ 14 ॥

By the word Tu (but) the above view is turned away. That Puruṣottama alone is the cause even of the products, Mahat etc., having for body the various entities immediately near to them. Whence? On account of that characteristic mark in the form of his reflection. Abhidnyāna is the thought—'May I be many'.

From the declaration in the Sruti about reflection taking the form of thought about being many, in the case of Ātman in (the passages)

'*That Tejas reflected—May I be many, may I procreate*' (Chā. 6·2·3)

'ता आप ऐक्षन्त बह्व्यः स्याम प्रजायेमहि' (छा. ६।२।४)

इति, आत्मनो बहुभवनसंकल्परूपेक्षणश्रवणान्महदहंकाराकाशादीनामपि कारणानां तथाविधेक्षापूर्विकैव स्वकार्यसृष्टिः, इति गम्यते। तथाविधं चेक्षणं तत्तच्छरीरकस्य परस्यैव ब्रह्मण उपपद्यते। श्रूयते च सर्वशरीरकत्वेन सर्वात्मकत्वं परस्य ब्रह्मणोऽन्तर्यामिब्राह्मणे

'यः पृथिव्यां तिष्ठन्' (बृ. ३।७।३)
'योऽप्सु तिष्ठन्' (बृ. ३।७।४)
'यस्तेजसि तिष्ठन्' (बृ. ३।७।१४)
'यो वायौ तिष्ठन्' (बृ. ३।७।७)
'य आकाशे तिष्ठन्' (बृ. ३।७।१२)

इत्यादि। सुबालोपनिषदि च

'यस्य पृथिवी शरीरम्'

इत्यारभ्य,

'यस्याहंकारः शरीरं यस्य बुद्धिः शरीरं यस्याव्यक्तं शरीरम्' (सुबा. ६)

इत्यादि ॥ १४ ॥

[336] यच्चोक्तम्—

'एतस्माज्जायते प्राणो मनः सर्वेन्द्रियाणि च।' (मु. २।१।३)

इत्यादिषु श्रूयमाणा ब्रह्मणः प्राणादिसृष्टिः परंपरयाप्युपपद्यत इति— अत्रोच्यते—

'Those Waters reflected — May we be many, may we procreate' (Chā. 6·2·4)

—regarding also the causes, Mahat, Ahaṁkāra, Ākāśa etc., it is known that the creation of their effects is preceded by that kind of reflection itself. And that kind of reflection is appropriate in the case of the Highest Brahman alone having those various entities as its body. It is declared in the *Brāhmaṇa* dealing with the inner Controller, that the Highest Brahman is the Ātman of everything because it has everything as its body —

'Who, abiding in Pṛthivī' (Br. 3·7·3)
'Who, abiding in Waters' (Br. 3·7·4)
'Who, abiding in Tejas' (Br. 3·7·14)
'Who, abiding in Wind' (Br. 3·7·7)
'Who, abiding in Ākāśa' (Br. 3·7·12)

And in the *Subālopaniṣad*, beginning with

'Whose body (is) Pṛthivī'

'Whose body (is) Ahaṁkāra, whose body (is) Buddhi, whose body (is) the Avyakta' (Subā. 6)

etc. ‖ 14 ‖

[336] As to the statement that the creation of Prāṇa etc., from Brahman, declared in the Śruti

'From this one, are produced Prāṇa, mind and all sense-organs' (Mu. 2·1·3)

is appropriate even if (the creation is) indirect, in succession, —here, it is stated (in reply)—

विपर्ययेण तु क्रमोत उपपद्यते च ॥ १५ ॥

तुशब्दोऽवधारणार्थः। अव्यक्तमहदहंकाराकाशादिक्रमाद्विपर्ययेण यः सर्वेषां कार्याणां ब्रह्मानन्तर्यरूपः क्रमः

'एतस्माज्जायते प्राणः' (मु. २।१।३)

इत्यादिषु प्रतीयते, स च क्रमस्तत्तद्रूपाद्ब्रह्मणस्तत्तत्कार्योत्पत्तेरेवोपपद्यते। परंपरया कारणत्वे हि, आनन्तर्यश्रवणमुपरुध्येत। अतः,

'एतस्माज्जायते' (मु. २।१।३)

इत्यादिकमपि सर्वस्य ब्रह्मणः साक्षात्संभवोत्तम्भनम् ॥ १५ ॥

अन्तरा विज्ञानमनसी क्रमेण तल्लिङ्गादिति चेन्नाविशेषात् ॥ १६ ॥

विज्ञानसाधनत्वादिन्द्रियाणि विज्ञानमित्युच्यन्ते। यदुक्तम्—

'एतस्माज्जायते' (मु. २।१।३)

इत्यादिना सर्वस्य ब्रह्मणोऽनन्तरकार्यत्वं श्राव्यते। अतश्चानेन वाक्येन सर्वस्य साक्षाद्ब्रह्मण उत्पत्तिरभिध्यानलिङ्गावगतोत्तभ्यत इति —तच्चोपपद्यते, क्रमविशेषपरत्वादस्य वाक्यस्य। अत्रापि सर्वेषां क्रमप्रतीतेः, खादिषु तावच्छ्रुत्यन्तरसिद्धः क्रमोऽत्रापि प्रतीयते। तैः सहपाठलिङ्गाद्भूतप्राणयोरन्तराले विज्ञानमनसी अपि क्रमेणोत्पद्येते, इति प्रतीयते। अतः सर्वस्य

But the order in the reverse is appropriate, thus ॥ 15 ॥

The word Tu is for the sake of emphasis. Which order of all effects, being subsequent to Brahman, is apprehended in (the passage)

'From this, is produced Prāṇa' (Mu. 2·1·3)

etc., — in the reverse order, Avyakta, Mahat, Ahaṁkāra, Ākāśa etc., — that order is appropriate, only if there is the creation of various effects from Brahman of various forms. If Brahman were to be the indirect (mediate) cause in succession, being the immediate mentioned in the Śruti would be contradicted. Therefore, the declaration such as in (the passage)

'From this, is produced' (Mu. 2·1·3)

etc., also, does prop up (corroborate) everything being directly produced from Brahman. ॥ 15 ॥

If (it be argued) that Vijñāna and Manas are in order in between owing to the indication mark, (the reply is) — No, on account of non-distinction ॥ 16 ॥

The sense-organs are called Vijñāna because they are the means of Vijñāna (knowledge). As to the statement that everything being the immediate product of Brahman, is declared in (the Śruti-passage)—

'From this, is produced' (Mu. 2·1·3)

etc., and thus by this passage, is propped up the immediate origination of everything from Brahman, known from the indicative mark—reflection —that is not proper, because this passage aims at a particular order. On account of the apprehension even here of the order for all, the order in the case of Sky etc., established in other Śruti passages is apprehended even here. On account of the indicative mark being mentioned along with them, Vijñāna and mind also are apprehended as being produced in order, in between the elements and the

साक्षाद्ब्रह्मण एव संभवस्योत्तम्भकमिदं वाक्यं न भवतीति चेत्, —तन्न, अविशेषात्।
'एतस्माज्जायते प्राण' (मु २।१।३)
इत्यनेनाविशेषात्। विज्ञानमनसोः खादीनां च, एतस्माज्जायते, इत्यनेन साक्षात्संभवरूपसंबन्धस्याभिधेयस्य सर्वेषां प्राणादिपृथिव्यन्तानामविशिष्टत्वात्स एव विधेयो न क्रमः। श्रुत्यन्तरसिद्धक्रमविरोधाच्च नेदं क्रमपरम्, पृथिव्यप्सु प्रलीयते, इत्यारभ्य तम एकीभवति, इत्यन्तेन क्रमान्तरप्रतीतेः। अतोऽव्यक्तादिशरीरकात्परस्माद्ब्रह्मण एव सर्वकार्याणामुत्पत्तिः। तेज प्रभृतयश्च शब्दास्तदात्मभूतं ब्रह्मैवाभिदधति ॥ १६ ॥

[337] ननु, एवं सर्वशब्दानां ब्रह्मवाचित्वे सति तैस्तैः शब्दैस्तत्तद्वस्तुव्यपदेशो व्युत्पत्तिसिद्ध उपरुध्यते, तत्राह—

चराचरव्यपाश्रयस्तु स्यात्तद्व्यपदेशो भाक्तस्तद्भावभावित्वात् ॥ १७ ॥

तुशब्दश्चोदिताशङ्कानिवृत्त्यर्थः। निखिलजङ्गमस्थावरव्यपाश्रयस्तत्तच्छब्दव्यपदेशो भाक्तः, वाच्यैकदेशे भज्यते, इत्यर्थः। समस्तवस्तुप्रकारिणो ब्रह्मणः प्रकारभूतवस्तुमात्रग्राहिप्रत्यक्षादि-

---

Prāna Therefore this passage cannot be taken as propping up the direct origination of that from Brahman alone—if it is argued thus—(we say) No Aviśesāt—on account of the non-distinction from the passage

'*From this, is produced Prāna*' (Mu 2 1 3)

Because the relation of the form of direct origination of Vijñāna and mind and sky etc, mentioned in the passage—From this, is produced—is in common with all entities beginning with Prāna and ending with the Earth that same should be mentioned and not the order And on account of contradiction with the order established in other Sruti passages this does not aim at mentioning the order, on account of the apprehension of another order in the passage beginning with—the Earth gets merged in the Waters—and ending with—the Tamas becomes one— *Therefore there is the origination of all products from the Highest Brahman alone with Avyakta etc, as its body* And the words Tejas etc, denote Brahman itself which is their Ātman ‖ 16 ‖

[337] I say (says the objector)—If thus all the words were to denote Brahman the pointing out to the various things by the various words as established etymologically would be set aside There says—(the Sūtrakāra)

But that reference to the resort of movable and immovable is divided (secondary), on account of its envisaging the nature of that (Brahman) ‖ 17 ‖

The word Tu is for the purpose of removing the doubt raised The mention of the various words covering the entire movable and immovable things is divided—that is to say, it is applicable to the part of the thing denoted Because Brahman which has all the entities as its modes is incomprehensible by the means of proof, Direct perception etc, that apprehend

प्रमाणाविषयत्वाद्वेदान्तश्रवणात्प्राक्प्रकार्यप्रतीतेः प्रकारिप्रतीतिभावभावित्वाच्च तत्पर्यवसानस्य लोके तत्तद्वस्तुमात्रे वाच्यैकदेशे ते ते शब्दा भङ्क्त्वा भङ्क्त्वा व्यपदिश्यन्ते। अथवा तेजःप्रभृतिभिः शब्दैस्तत्तद्वस्तुमात्रवाचितया व्युत्पन्नैर्ब्रह्मणो व्यपदेशो भाक्तः स्यात्, अमुख्यः स्यात्, इत्याशङ्क्य, चराचरव्यपाश्रयस्तु, इत्याद्युच्यते। चराचरव्यपाश्रयः, तद्व्यपदेशः — तद्वाचिशब्दश्चराचरवाचिशब्दो ब्रह्मण्यभाक्तो मुख्य एव। कुतः? ब्रह्मभावभावित्वात्सर्वशब्दानां वाचकभावस्य। नामरूपव्याकरणश्रुत्या हि तथावगतम् ॥ १७ ॥

तेजोधिकरणं समाप्तम् (२)

नात्मा श्रुतेर्नित्यत्वाच्च ताभ्यः ॥ १८ ॥

(अधिकरण ३, सूत्रम् १८)

[338] वियदादेः कृत्स्नस्य परस्माद्ब्रह्मण उत्पत्तिरुक्ता। इदानीं जीवस्याप्युत्पत्तिरस्ति न वेति संशय्यते—किं युक्तम्? अस्तीति। कुतः? एकविज्ञानेन सर्वविज्ञानप्रतिज्ञोपपत्तेः, प्राक्सृष्टेरेकत्वावधारणाच्च। वियदादेरिव जीवस्याप्युत्पत्तिवादिन्यः श्रुतयश्च सन्ति—

'यतः प्रसूता जगतः प्रसूतिस्तोयेन जीवान्व्यससर्ज भूम्याम्।' (ना ११)

---

the entities that are the modes, and because there is no apprehension of the entity possessing the modes prior to the study of the Vedanta, and because the culmination refers to the realisation of Brahman possessed of modes, in popular parlance the various words are used to denote the parts, referring merely to the various entities that form mere portions of the various entities denoted Or, (the Sūtra) Carācaravyapāśrayastu, etc, is stated here, having raised the doubt — Is the reference to Brahman metaphorical, that is, not in the primary sense, by the words Tejas etc, denoting etymologically the various entities alone? Carācaravyapāśrayah, tadvyapadeśah — the word denoting that the word denoting the movable and the immovable is not metaphorical in respect of Brahman, that is, it is to be sure primary Whence? Because the denotative nature of all words points out to the nature of Brahman, for, that much is apprehended from the Sruti referring to name, form and modification ॥ 17 ॥

Here ends the Tejodhikarana (2)

Not the Ātman, on account of the Śruti, and on account of (the Ātman) being eternal from those (Śruti passages) ॥ 18 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 3, Sūtra 18)

[338] The origination of everything, Sky etc, is stated to be as from the Highest Brahman Now the doubt is raised — whether there is the origination of the Jiva also or not What (is) proper? There is Whence? On account of the solemn declaration about the knowledge of everything by the knowledge of one, being possible (only thus), and on account of oneness being emphasised prior to creation And there are Sruti passages speaking of the origination even of the Jiva like that of the Sky etc,—

'From whom has arisen the production of the world by means of the waters he let off Jivas on the earth' (Nā 11)

'प्रजापतिः प्रजा असृजत' (तै. ब्रा. १।१।१०)

'सन्मूलाः सोम्येमाः सर्वाः प्रजाः सदायतनाः सत्प्रतिष्ठाः' (छा. ६।८।४)

'यतो वा इमानि भूतानि जायन्ते' (तै. ३।१।१)

इति। एवं सचेतनस्य जगत उत्पत्तिवचनाज्जीवस्याप्युत्पत्तिः प्रतीयते। न च वाच्यम्—ब्रह्मणो नित्यत्वात् 'तत्त्वमसि' आदिभिर्जीवस्य ब्रह्मत्वावगमाज्जीवस्य नित्यत्वमिति,

'ऐतदात्म्यमिदं सर्वम्' (छा. ६।८।७)

'सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्म' (छा. ३।१४।१)

इत्येवमादिभिर्वियदादेरपि ब्रह्मत्वावगमात्तस्यापि नित्यत्वप्रसक्तेः। अतो जीवोऽपि वियदादिवदुत्पद्यते, इति। एवं प्राप्ते, अभिधीयते— नात्मा श्रुतेः, इति। नात्मोत्पद्यते। कुतः? श्रुतेः।

'न जायते म्रियते वा विपश्चित्' (का २।१८)

'ज्ञाज्ञौ द्वावजावीशानीशौ' (श्वे. १।९)

इत्यादिभिर्जीवस्योत्पत्तिप्रतिषेधो हि श्रूयते। आत्मनो नित्यत्वं च ताभ्यः श्रुतिभ्य एवावगम्यते।

'नित्यो नित्यानां चेतनश्चेतनानामेको बहूनां यो विदधाति कामान्।'

(श्वे. ६।१३)

'Prajāpati created the people' (Tai. Brā. 1·1·10)

'All these people, gentle one, are rooted in Sat, have their abode in Sat, have their stability in Sat' (Chā. 6·8·4)

'From whom, verily, are produced these creatures (elements)' (Tai. 3·1·1)

—Thus on account of the statement about the origination of the world along with the sentient, the origination even of the Jīva is apprehended. And it should not be said that on account of Brahman being eternal, and Jīva being apprehended as being Brahman, in passages 'That thou art' etc., Jīva is eternal; because in that case, on account of the Sky etc., also being known to be Brahman from passages like

'All this, has this as the Ātman' (Chā. 6·8·7)

'All this indeed (is) Brahman' (Chā. 3 14 1)

those also would have perforce to be admitted as eternal. Therefore, the Jiva also like the Sky etc., is originated—This (prima-facie view) being reached, it is stated (in reply)—Nātmā, Śruteḥ—the Ātman is not originated. Whence? On account of the Śruti. In (the following) passages and others—

'The wise one is neither born, nor dies' (Kā. 2·18)

'The knower and non-knower, the two unborn—the Controller, the non-Controller' (Śve 1·9)

is declared by the Śruti the repudiation of the origination of Jīva. And the eternal nature of Ātman is apprehended from those Śruti passages themselves

'Eternal among the eternals, the sentient among the sentients, one among the many, who lays down the desires' (Śve 6 13)

'अजो नित्यः शाश्वतोऽयं पुराणो न हन्यते हन्यमाने शरीरे।' (का. २।१८)

इत्यादिभ्यः। अतश्च नात्मोत्पद्यते। कथं तर्ह्येकविज्ञानेन सर्वविज्ञानप्रतिज्ञोपपद्यते ? इत्थमुपपद्यते— जीवस्यापि कार्यत्वात्कारणकार्ययोरनन्यत्वाच्च। एवं तर्हि वियदादिवदुत्पत्तिमत्त्वमङ्गीकृतं स्यात्। नेत्युच्यते। कार्यत्वं हि नामैकस्य द्रव्यस्यावस्थान्तरापत्तिः। तज्जीवस्याप्यस्त्येव। इयांस्तु विशेषः -- वियदादेरचेतनस्य यादृशोऽन्यथाभावो न तादृशो जीवस्य। ज्ञानसंकोचविकासलक्षणो जीवस्यान्यथाभावः, वियदादेस्तु स्वरूपान्यथाभावलक्षणः। सेयं स्वरूपान्यथाभावलक्षणोत्पत्तिर्जीवे प्रतिषिध्यते।

एतदुक्तं भवति-- भोग्यभोक्तृनियन्तॄन्विविक्तस्वभावान्प्रतिपाद्य, भोग्यगतमुत्पत्त्यादिकं भोक्तरि प्रतिषिध्य, तस्य नित्यतां च प्रतिपाद्य, भोग्यगतमुत्पत्त्यादिकं भोक्तृगतं चापुरुषार्थाश्रयत्वं नियन्तरि प्रतिषिध्य, तस्य नित्यत्वं निरवद्यत्वं सर्वदा सर्वज्ञत्वं सत्यसंकल्पत्वं करणाधिपाधिपत्वं विश्वस्य पतित्वं च प्रतिपाद्य, सर्वावस्थयोश्चिदचितोस्तं प्रति शरीरत्वं तस्य चात्मत्वं प्रतिपादितम्। अतः सर्वदा चिदचिद्वस्तुशरीरतया तत्प्रकारं ब्रह्म। तत्कदाचित्स्वस्मा-

---

'Unborn, eternal, permanent, this, the ancient one, is not killed, when the body is being killed' (Kā. 2 18)

etc. And thus the Ātman is not originated. How is then the solemn declaration about the knowledge of everything by the knowledge of one, feasible? —Thus it is feasible — on account of the Jiva also being a product, and also on account of cause and effect being non-different. (The objector) —Well, in that case, that would be tantamount to admitting (Jīva) having origination as the Sky etc. — (We reply) — No; for, being a product is, indeed, the taking to another state, by one (and the same) substance, and that (kind of Kāryatva) does exist in the case of Jiva also. This, however is the distinction — There is not that kind of transformation in the case of Jiva as obtains in the case of Viyat etc., that are non-sentient. Changing over to another state in the case of the Jiva is characterised by contraction and expansion of knowledge. In the case of sky etc. however, it is characterised by the transformation of one's (very) nature. And that such origination characterised by the change over of one's nature is repudiated in the case of the Jiva.

This is what is intended to be said —Having propounded the object of enjoyment, enjoyer, and the Controller as having separate characters; having negatived in the case of the enjoyer, origination etc., belonging to the object of enjoyment; having propounded its eternal nature, also; having negatived in the case of the Controller, origination etc., belonging to the object of enjoyment, and not being the resort of salvation, belonging to the enjoyer; having propounded as well his eternal nature, blameless state, being omniscient, being with thoughts fulfilled, being the master of masters of sense-organs, being the Lord of Universe at all time;—it has been propounded that the sentient and the non-sentient in all the states are the body in respect to him, and that he is the Ātman. Therefore, Brahman, on account of having for its body the sentient and the non-sentient entities always, has them as its modes. Having the sentient and

द्विभक्तव्यपदेशानर्हातिसूक्ष्मदशापन्नचिदचिद्वस्तुशरीरं तिष्ठति, तत्कारणावस्थं ब्रह्म। कदाचिच्च विभक्तनामरूपस्थूलचिदचिद्वस्तुशरीरम्, तच्च कार्यावस्थम्। तत्र कारणावस्थस्य कार्यावस्थापत्तावचिदंशस्य कारणावस्थायां शब्दादिविहीनस्य भोग्यत्वाय शब्दादिमत्तया स्वरूपान्यथाभावरूपविकारो भवति। चिदंशस्य च कर्मफलविशेषभोक्तृत्वाय तदनुरूपज्ञान-विकासरूपविकारो भवति। उभयप्रकारविशिष्टनियन्त्रंशे तत्तदवस्थतदुभयविशिष्टतारूपविकारो भवति। कारणावस्थाया अवस्थान्तरापत्तिरूपो विकारः प्रकारद्वये प्रकारिणि च समानः। अत एव, एकस्यावस्थान्तरापत्तिरूपविकारापेक्षया

'येनाश्रुतं श्रुतम्' (छा. ६।१।१)

इति, एकविज्ञानेन सर्वविज्ञानं प्रतिज्ञाय मृदादिदृष्टान्तः

'यथा सोम्यैकेन' (छा. ६।१।१)

इत्यादिना निदर्शितः। ईदृशज्ञानसंकोचविकासकरतत्तद्देहसंबन्धवियोगाभिप्राया जीवस्योत्पत्ति-मरणवादिन्यः

'प्रजापतिः प्रजा असृजत' (तै ब्रा. १।१।१०)

---

the non-sentient as its body, it exists, sometimes attaining to the extremely subtle state not deserving to be designated as separate from itself; — that is Brahman in the causal state. Sometimes it has for the body the sentient and non-sentient bodies, gross, with separate names and forms — that is Brahman in the state of the effect. There, when (Brahman) in the causal state attains to the state of effect, the non-sentient portion which is bereft of (distinctions due to) words etc., in the causal state, becomes possessed of (the distinctive features) words etc., *for being fit for enjoyment, and thus there is the modification of the nature* of change over of one's own form. And in the case of the sentient portion for being the enjoyer of the particular fruits of Karman, there is the transformation in the form of the expansion of cognition befitting that. And in the Controller -portion particularised by both modes, *there is the transformation in the* form of being particularised by both, in the various states. The transformation of the causal state, in the form of attaining to another state, is common to the two modes and the entity possessing the mode. For this very reason, after having made the solemn declaration — the knowledge of everything by the knowledge of one — in (the passage)

'*By which the unheard is heard*' (Chā. 6·1·1)

—the illustrative instance of earth etc., has been pointed out in (the passage)—

'*As, gentle one, by one*' (Chā. 6·1·1)

etc taking into account the transformation in the form of attaining to another state of one entity. And there are the Śruti passages such as

'*Prajāpati created the people*' (*Tai. Br.* 1·1·10)

etc, speaking of the origination and death of the Jīva, intending to refer to the connection and separation of the various bodies, contributing to the contraction

इत्याद्याः श्रुतयः। अचिदंशवत्स्वरूपान्यथात्वाभावाभिप्राया उत्पत्तिप्रतिषेधवादिन्यो नित्यत्ववादिन्यश्च

'न जायते म्रियते' (का २।१८)

इत्याद्याः,

'नित्यो नित्यानाम्' (श्वे. ६।१३)

इत्याद्याश्च श्रुतयः। स्वरूपान्यथात्वज्ञानसंकोचविकासरूपोभयविधानिष्टविकाराभावाभिप्रायाः

'स वा एष महानज आत्माजरोऽमरोऽमृतो ब्रह्म' (बृ. ४।४।२५)

'नित्यो नित्यानाम्' (श्वे. ६।१३)

इत्याद्याः परविषयाः श्रुतयः। एवं सर्वदा चिदचिद्वस्तुविशिष्टस्य ब्रह्मणः प्राक्सृष्टेरेकत्वावधारणं च नामरूपविभागाभावादुपपद्यते।

'तद्धेदं तर्ह्यव्याकृतमासीत्। तन्नामरूपाभ्यां व्याक्रियत' (बृ १।४।७)

इति हि नामरूपविभागभावाभावाभ्यां नानात्वैकत्वे वदन्ति, इति।

[339] ये त्वविद्योपाधिकं जीवत्वं वदन्ति, ये च पारमार्थिकोपाधिकृतम्, ये च सन्मात्रस्वरूपं ब्रह्म स्वयमेव भोक्तृभोग्यनियन्तृरूपेण त्रिधावस्थितं वदन्ति— सर्वेऽप्येते,

---

and expansion of such knowledge. And there are Śruti passages such as

'Is not born, dies (not)' (Kā. 2·18)

and such like

'Eternal among the eternals' (Śve. 6·13)

speaking of the negation of origination and speaking of eternal nature intending to refer to the absence of change of one's nature, like the non-sentient portion. There are Śruti passages referring to the Highest such as —

'He, verily, this great unborn Ātman, ageless, immortal, deathless — Brahman' (Br. 4·4·25)

'Eternal among the eternals' (Śve. 6·13)

intending to refer to the absence of change over of one's nature, and the absence of any undesirable changes of both kinds, of the nature of contraction and expansion of knowledge. Thus, the definite statement about Brahman being one prior to creation, particularised by the sentient and non-sentient, for all times, is appropriate, on account of the absence of the division into name and form.

'That, verily, this was unmodified then; it became modified in name and form' (Br. 1·4·7)

--thus they speak of manifoldness and oneness as due to the presence and absence (respectively) of the division into name and form.

[339] As for those who speak of the nature of Jiva as due to the limiting adjunct of Avidyā, and those, as due to a real limiting adjunct; and those who speak of Brahman with only existence as its nature, as staying threefold in the forms — enjoyer, object of enjoyment and Controller; — all these do sub-

अविद्याशक्तेरुपाधिशक्तेर्भोक्तृभोग्यनियन्तृशक्तीनां च प्रलयकालेऽवस्थानेऽपि तदानीमेकत्वावधारणं नामरूपविभागाभावादेवोपपादयन्ति

'वैषम्यनैर्घृण्ये न सापेक्षत्वात्... । न कर्माविभागादिति चेन्नानादित्वादुपपद्यते चाप्युपलभ्यते च ' (ब्र. सू. २।१।३४-३५)

इति सूत्राभ्यां जीवभेदस्य तत्कर्मप्रवाहस्य चानादित्वाभ्युपगमाच्च । इयान्विशेषः — एकस्यानाद्यविद्यया ब्रह्म स्वयमेव मुह्यति। अन्यस्य पारमार्थिकानाद्युपाधिना ब्रह्मस्वरूपमेव बध्यते, उपाधिब्रह्मव्यतिरिक्तवस्त्वन्तराभावात्। अपरस्य ब्रह्मैव विचित्राकारेण परिणमते, कर्मफलानि चानिष्टानि भुङ्क्ते। नियन्त्रंशस्य भोक्तृत्वाभावेऽपि सर्वज्ञत्वात्स्वस्मादभिन्नं भोक्तारमनुसंदधातीति स्वयमेव भुङ्क्ते । अस्माकं तु स्थूलसूक्ष्मावस्थचिदचिद्वस्तुशरीरं ब्रह्म कार्यकारणोभयावस्थावस्थितमपि सर्वदा निरस्तनिखिलदोषगन्धं सत्यसंकल्पत्वाद्यपरिमितोदारगुणसागरमवतिष्ठते। प्रकारभूतचिदचिद्वस्तुगता अपुरुषार्थाः स्वरूपान्यथाभावश्चेति सर्वं समञ्जसम् ॥ १८ ॥

आत्माधिकरणं समाप्तम् (३)

---

scribe to the definite statement of oneness, on account of the absence itself of the distinction in name and form at that time (of dissolution) although the power of Avidyā, the power of the limiting adjunct, and the power of enjoyer, the object of enjoyment and the Controller, do persevere at the time of the universal dissolution; on account of the admitting of beginninglessness of the division of Jīvas and the stream of their Karman by the Sūtras —

'Disparity and mercilessness (exist) not, on account of (Īśvara) being dependent... if (it be argued) that Karman (exists) not, on account of non-division, that is appropriate on account of the beginninglessness (of Saṃsāra), and it is so experienced' — (Bra. Sū. II. 1·34·35)

This, however, is the speciality (here) — According to one, Brahman of its own accord, gets infatuated by the beginningless Avidyā, for another, the very nature of Brahman is circumscribed by a real beginningless adjunct, on account of the absence of any entity other than Brahman with the limiting adjunct. According to another (third) one, Brahman itself is transformed in various forms and enjoys the undesirable fruits of Karman. Even though the Controller-portion is not the enjoyer, still on account of omniscience, it gets associated with the enjoyer, not different from it, and so it itself enjoys. As for us, Brahman having for its body, sentient and non-sentient entities in gross and subtle conditions, although staying in both the states, — that of the cause and that of the effect — does remain always with any trace of any blemish removed, being the ocean of endless noble qualities like being with thoughts fulfilled etc. And there matters not pertaining to salvation belong to sentient and non-sentient entities that are the modes, and also the change over of one's own nature — all this is thus reasonable. ॥ 18 ॥

Here ends the Ātmādhikaraṇa (3)

ज्ञोत एव ॥ १९ ॥

(अधिकरण ४, सूत्राणि १९–३२)

[340] वियदादिवज्जीवो नोत्पद्यत इत्युक्तम्। तप्रसङ्गेन जीवस्वरूपं निरूप्यते—किं सुगतकपिलाभिमतचिन्मात्रमेवात्मनः स्वरूपम्, उत कणभुगभिमतपाषाणकल्पस्वरूपमचित्स्वरूपमेवागन्तुकचैतन्यगुणकम्, अथ ज्ञातृत्वमेवास्य स्वरूपम्? इति।

किं युक्तम्? चिन्मात्रम्, इति। कुतः? तथा श्रुतेः। अन्तर्यामिब्राह्मणे हि

'य आत्मनि तिष्ठन्'

इति माध्यंदिनीयपर्यायस्य स्थाने

'यो विज्ञाने तिष्ठन्' (बृ. ३।७।२२)

इति काण्वा अधीयते। तथा

'विज्ञानं यज्ञं तनुते कर्माणि तनुतेऽपि च' (तै. २।५)

इति कर्तुरात्मनो विज्ञानमेव स्वरूपं श्रूयते। स्मृतिषु च

'ज्ञानस्वरूपमत्यन्तनिर्मलं परमार्थतः।' (वि पु. १।२।६)

इत्यादिष्वात्मनो ज्ञानस्वरूपत्वं प्रतीयते। अपरस्तु-जीवात्मनो ज्ञानत्वे ज्ञातृत्वे च स्वाभाविकेऽभ्युपगम्यमाने, तस्य सर्वगतस्य सर्वदा सर्वत्रोपलब्धिप्रसङ्गात्करणानां च वैयर्थ्यात्सुषुप्तिमूर्छा-

---

The knower, for this very reason ॥ 19 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 4, Sūtras 19–32)

[**340**] It is stated that the Jīva is not produced, like the Sky etc. In that connection, the nature of Jīva is looked into — Is the nature of Ātman mere consciousness favoured by the Bauddhas and Kapila; or is it the non-sentient nature itself, like the nature resembling that of a stone, favoured by Kaṇāda (the Vaiśeṣikas), with the occasional quality of consciousness; or is, being the knower itself, the nature of this (Jīva) ?

What (is) proper? Mere consciousness. Whence? On account of the Śruti to that effect. In the *Brāhmaṇa* dealing with the inner-Controller, the followers of the Kaṇva recension read —

'Who, abiding in Vijñāna' (Bṛ. 3·7·22)

in place of the alternative reading in the Mādhyandina recension —

'Who, abiding in Ātman'.

Similarly in (the passage),

'Vijñāna spreads the sacrifice, and spreads the Karmans also' (Tai. 2·5)

is to be found the nature of the doer Ātman, as Vijñāna itself. And in the, Smṛti passages

'The nature of Jñāna, extremely pure, in reality' (V. P. 1·2·6)

etc. is apprehended Ātman as having knowledge as his nature, (As for) the second however, (this is the position) — If it is admitted that Jīvātman is naturally the knowledge as well as the knower, there would perforce be his presence everywhere at all time as he is all-pervading, and the sense-organs would be

दिषु सतोऽप्यात्मनश्चैतन्यानुपलब्धेः, जाग्रतः सामग्र्यां सत्यां ज्ञानोत्पत्तिदर्शनादस्य न ज्ञानं स्वरूपम्, नापि ज्ञातृत्वम्। आगन्तुकमेव तु चैतन्यम्। सर्वगतत्वं चात्मनोऽवश्याभ्युपेत्यम्। सर्वत्र कार्योपलब्धेः सर्वत्रात्मनः संनिधानाभ्युपगमात्, शरीरगमनेनैव कार्यसंभवे सति गतिकल्पनायां प्रमाणाभावाच्च। श्रुतिरपि सुषुप्तिवेलायां ज्ञानाभावं दर्शयति

'नाहं खल्वयमेवं संप्रत्यात्मानं जानात्ययमहमस्मीति नो एवेमानि भूतानि' (छा. ८।११।१)

इति। तथा मोक्षदशायां ज्ञानाभावं दर्शयति

'न प्रेत्य संज्ञास्ति' (बृ. २।४।१२; ४।५।१३)

इति।

'ज्ञानस्वरूपम्' (वि. पु. १।२।६)

इत्यादिप्रयोगस्तु ज्ञानस्य तदसाधारणगुणत्वेन लाक्षणिकः, इति।

[341] एवं प्राप्ते, प्रचक्ष्महे— ज्ञोऽत एव। ज्ञ एवायमात्मा ज्ञातृस्वरूप एव, न ज्ञानमात्रम्, नापि जडस्वरूपः। कुतः? अत एव। श्रुतेरेवेत्यर्थः।

'नात्मा श्रुतेः' (ब्र. सू. २।३।१८)

---

useless; and in the states of deep sleep, swoon, etc., even though the Ātman is there, there is the non-perception of cognition, and in the waking state, there is the perception of origination of cognition, when the means thereof are there — and so, this Jīva has not knowledge as his nature, not is he a knower. And the consciousness is, verily, occasional. The all-pervading nature in the case of Ātman has got to be necessarily admitted, on account of its effects being seen everywhere, on account of the admission of the presence of the Ātman everywhere, and on account of the absence of any means of proof for postulating any movement when the effect can be possibly had by the movement itself of the body. The Śruti also points out to the absence of cognition in deep sleep in

'This one, O wonder, does not know thus now the Ātman, — I am this one, these beings are not indeed (there)' (Chā. 8·11·1)

Similarly (the Śruti) points out to the absence of cognition in the state of salvation, in (the passage)

'Not, having departed, there is cognition' (Br. 2·4·12; 4·5·13)

The use of the expression

'The nature of Jñāna' (V.P 1·2·6)

etc., (to describe Ātman) is metaphorical (and indicates) that cognition is his peculiar quality.

[341] This (prima-facie view) being reached, we say (in reply)— The knower, for this very reason. The Ātman is the knower himself, having the nature of the knower alone, not merely consciousness; not again, having a non-sentient nature. Whence? For this very reason, that is to say, from the Śruti itself. The Śruti-passage referred to in (the Sūtra)

'Not the Ātman, on account of the Śruti' (Bra. Sū. II. 3·18)

[343] नाणुरतच्छ्रुतेरिति चेन्नेतराधिकारात् ॥ २२ ॥

'योऽयं विज्ञानमयः प्राणेषु' (बृ. ४।३।७; ४।४।२२)

इति जीवं प्रस्तुत्य

'स वा एष महानज आत्मा' (बृ. ४।४।२२)

इति महत्त्वश्रुतेर्नाणुर्जीव इति चेत् — न, इतराधिकारात्। जीवादितरस्य प्राज्ञस्य तत्राधिकारात्। यद्यप्युपक्रमे जीवः प्रस्तुतस्तथापि

'यस्यानुवित्तः प्रतिबुद्ध आत्मा' (बृ. ४।४।१३)

इति मध्ये परः प्रतिपाद्यत इति तत्संबन्धीदं महत्त्वं न जीवस्य ॥ २२ ॥

स्वशब्दोन्मानाभ्यां च ॥ २३ ॥

साक्षादणुशब्द एव श्रूयते—

'एषोऽणुरात्मा चेतसा वेदितव्यो
यस्मिन्प्राणः पञ्चधा संविवेश।' (मु. ३।१।९)

इति। उद्धृत्य मानम्-उन्मानम्। अणुसदृशं वस्तूद्धृत्य तन्मानत्वं जीवस्य श्रूयते

'बालाग्रशतभागस्य शतधा कल्पितस्य च।
भागो जीवः स विज्ञेयः स चानन्त्याय कल्पते॥' (श्वे. ५।९)

---

[343] (If it be said) Not atomic, on account of no-Śruti to that effect, — (the reply is) — No, on account of (the topic) concerning the other one ॥ 22 ॥

If it be said that in (the passage),

'Who, this constituted of Vijñāna among the Prāṇas' (Bṛ. 4·3·7; 4·4·22)

introducing the Jīva, there is the Śruti describing his greatness,

'He, verily, this great unborn Ātman' (Bṛ. 4·4·22)

and so, Jīva is not atomic — (To this, we reply) — No, on account of (the topic) concerning the other one; on account of the Prājña, other than the Jīva, being the topic there. Although in the introductory part Jīva is the matter in hand, still, because in the middle, the Highest is propounded as in —

'To whom is known the awakened Ātman' (Bṛ. 4·4·13)

— and so, this greatness (magnitude) is in respect of that, and not (in respect) of the Jīva. ॥ 22 ॥

And on account of the direct word (Aṇu being used) and the dimension. ॥ 23 ॥

The word Aṇu is directly mentioned in (the Śruti-passage)—

'This Aṇu (atomic) Ātman should be known by the mind, where the Prāṇa has entered five-fold'. (Mu. 3·1·9)

Unmāna — measurement extracted; having taken up the thing resembling the atom, it is mentioned (in the Śruti) about Jīva having that measure—

'That Jīva should be known as a portion of the hundredth part of the tip of the hair cut down a hundredfold, and he is meant to be endless'. (Śve. 5·9)

इति ।

'आराग्रमात्रो ह्यवरोऽपि दृष्टः' (श्वे. ५।८)

इति च । अतोऽणुरेवायमात्मा ॥ २३ ॥

[344] अथ स्यात् — आत्मनोऽणुत्वे सकलशरीरव्यापिनी वेदना नोपपद्यत इति- तत्र मतान्तरेण परिहारमाह—

अविरोधश्चन्दनवत् ॥ २४ ॥

यथा हरिचन्दनबिन्दुर्देहैकदेशवर्त्यपि सकलदेहव्यापिनमाह्लादं जनयति, तद्वदात्मापि देहैकदेशवर्ती सकलदेहवर्तिनीं वेदनामनुभवति ॥ २४ ॥

अवस्थितिवैशेष्यादिति चेन्नाभ्युपगमाद्धृदि हि ॥ २५ ॥

हरिचन्दनबिन्द्वादेर्देहदेशविशेषावस्थितिविशेषात्, तथाभावः। आत्मनस्तु तन्न विद्यत इति चेत् — न, आत्मनोऽपि देहदेशविशेषे स्थित्यभ्युपगमात्। हृदयदेशे ह्यात्मनः स्थितिः श्रूयते

'हृदि ह्येष आत्मा तत्रैकशतं नाडीनाम्' (प्र. ३।६)

इति। तथा

'कतम आत्मा' (बृ. ४।३।७)

And also,

'The lower one is, indeed, seen as measuring the tip of the awl'. (Śve. 5·8)

So this Ātman is, verily, atomic. ‖23‖

[344] It may be argued — If Ātman is atomic, pain pervading the whole body is not possible — There (the Sūtrakāra first) gives the refutation in accordance with another view—

Non-contradiction like the sandal ‖ 24 ‖

Just as a drop of (red sandal) Haricandana, although remaining on one part of the body, produces delight pervading the whole of the body, — like that, the Ātman also, abiding in one part of the body, experiences pain abiding in the whole of the body ‖ 24 ‖

If (it be argued, it is so in the case of the sandal) on account of its particular habitat, — (the reply is) — No, on account of (a particular habitat, in the case of the Ātman) being indeed admitted in the heart (— region) ‖ 25 ‖

If it be said — Because the drop of Haricandana etc., has a special abode in the particular part of the body, and so, there is that kind of nature (experience). But that does not exist in the case of the Ātman — (we say) — No, because even in the case of the Ātman, existence in a particular part of the body is admitted. The staying of the Ātman in the heart-region is mentioned in the Śruti —

'This Ātman is indeed in the heart, and there are a hundred and one veins.' (Pra. 3·6)

Similarly, introducing (the Ātman)

'Which, Ātman' (Bṛ. 4·3·7)

इति प्रकृत्य 'योऽयं विज्ञानमयः प्राणेषु हृद्यन्तर्ज्योतिः' (बृ. ४।३।७)

इति। आत्मनो देहदेशविशेषस्थितिख्यापनाय चन्दनदृष्टान्तः प्रदर्शितः। न तु चन्दनस्य देशविशेषापेक्षा ॥ २५ ॥

एकदेशवर्तिनः सकलदेहव्यापिकार्यकरत्वप्रकारं स्वमतेनाह—

गुणाद्वालोकवत् ॥ २६ ॥

वाशब्दो मतान्तरव्यावृत्त्यर्थः। आत्मा स्वगुणेन ज्ञानेन सकलदेहं व्याप्यावस्थितः। आलोकवत्— यथा मणिद्युमणिप्रभृतीनामेकदेशवर्तिनामालोको नैकदेशव्यापी दृश्यते, तद्वद्धृदयस्थस्यात्मनो ज्ञानं सकलदेहं व्याप्य वर्तते। ज्ञातुः प्रभास्थानीयस्य ज्ञानस्य स्वाश्रयादन्यत्र वृत्तिर्मणिप्रभावदुपपद्यत इति प्रथमसूत्रे स्थापितम् ॥ २६ ॥

[345] ननूक्तं ज्ञानमात्रमेवात्मा, इति। तत्कथं ज्ञानस्य स्वरूपव्यतिरिक्तगुणत्वमुच्यते? तत्राह—

व्यतिरेको गन्धवत्तथा च दर्शयति ॥ २७ ॥

यथा पृथिव्या गन्धस्य गुणत्वेनोपलभ्यमानस्य ततो व्यतिरेकः, तथा जानामीति ज्ञातृगुणत्वेन प्रतीयमानस्य ज्ञानस्यात्मनो व्यतिरेकः सिद्धः। दर्शयति च श्रुतिः

---

as

'Who, this one, constituted of Vijñāna, among the Prāṇas, the inner light in the heart' (Br. 4·3·7)

etc.— The illustrative instance of the sandal is set forth to point out the abiding of the Atman in a particular part of the body. In the case of the sandal, however, there is no need of a specific region. ॥ 25 ॥

(The Sūtrakāra) refers according to his own view, to the manner in which a thing residing in one part can do its task of pervading the whole body

Or, on account of the quality, like light ॥ 26 ॥

The word Vā is for the purpose of excluding the other view. The Ātman remains pervading the whole body, by his quality, — knowledge — like light. Just as the light of gems, the Sun etc , residing only in one region is not seen as pervading (only) one region; similarly the consciousness of the Atman residing in the heart is there, pervading the whole body. It is proper that the cognition standing in the position of the lustre, of the knower, exists elsewhere than its own resort, like the lustre of the gem, — this has been established in the first Sūtra. ॥ 26 ॥

[345] I say (says the objector) — It has been stated that mere consciousness alone is the Ātman; then, how is it stated that consciousness is the quality apart from his nature? — There (the Sūtrakāra) says (by way of reply) —

The separateness, like the smell, and (the Śruti) points out to that effect. ॥ 27 ॥

Just as the smell which is perceived as the quality of the Earth is other than that, similarly, that consciousness which is apprehended as the quality of the knower, in the form — I know — is proved to be separate from the Atman.

'जानात्येवायं पुरुषः'

इति ॥ २७ ॥

पृथगुपदेशात् ॥ २८ ॥

स्वशब्देनैव विज्ञानं विज्ञातुः पृथगुपदिश्यते

'न हि विज्ञातुर्विज्ञातेर्विपरिलोपो विद्यते' (बृ. ४।३।३०)

इति ॥ २८ ॥

[346] यत्तूक्तम्—

'यो विज्ञाने तिष्ठन्' (बृ ३।७।२२)

'विज्ञानं यज्ञं तनुते' (तै. २।५)

'ज्ञानस्वरूपमत्यन्तनिर्मलम्' (वि पु १।२।६)

इत्यादिषु ज्ञानमेवात्मेति व्यपदिश्यत इति, तत्राह —

तद्गुणसारत्वात्तु तद्व्यपदेशः प्राज्ञवत् ॥ २९ ॥

तुशब्दश्चोद्यं व्यावर्तयति । तद्गुणसारत्वात्— विज्ञानगुणसारत्वात्, आत्मनो विज्ञानमिति व्यपदेशः। विज्ञानमेवास्य सारभूतो गुणः। यथा प्राज्ञस्यानन्दः सारभूतो गुण इति प्राज्ञ आनन्दशब्देन व्यपदिश्यते

'यदेष आकाश आनन्दो न स्यात्' (तै २।७)

'आनन्दो ब्रह्मेति व्यजानात्' (तै ३।६)

इति। प्राज्ञस्य ह्यानन्दः सारभूतो गुणः

And the Sruti also points out (the same) in—

'*This Purusa does know*'

॥ 27 ॥

On account of being shown as separate ॥ 28 ॥

Vijñāna is shown to be separate, by (the use of) that same word, from the knower in (the passage)

'*There is indeed no elision of the consciousness of the knower*' (Br. 4·3·30)

॥ 28 ॥

[346] As to what has been stated in (passages)

'*Who, abiding in Vijñāna*' (Br. 3·7·22)

'*Vijñāna spreads the sacrifice*' (Tai. 2·5)

'*The nature of Jñāna, extremely pure*' (V. P. 1·2·6)

etc., it is pointed out that Jñāna alone is the Atman — There says (the Sūtrakāra)

The designation of that (Vijñāna), on account of the Ātman's having that quality as his essence, like Prājña. ॥ 29 ॥

The word Tu turns away the objection. Tadgunasāratvāt — on account of having the quality of Vijñāna as the essence, there is the designation of Atman as Vijñāna. Vijñāna alone is his essential quality. Just as, because bliss is the essential quality of Prājña, Prājña is referred to by the word Ānanda (bliss) in

'*If this Ākāśa were not the Ānanda*' (Tai. 2·7)

'*One should know Ānanda as Brahman*'. (Tai. 3 6)

For, indeed of the Prājña, Ānanda is the essential quality, in (passages)

'स एको ब्रह्मण आनन्दः' (तै. २।८)
'आनन्दं ब्रह्मणो विद्वान्न बिभेति कुतश्चन' (तै. २।९)

इति। यथा वा

'सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म' (तै. २।१)

इति विपश्चितः प्राज्ञस्य ज्ञानशब्देन व्यपदेशः।

'सह ब्रह्मणा विपश्चिता' (तै. २।१)
'यः सर्वज्ञः' (मु. १।१।९)

इत्यादिषु प्राज्ञस्य ज्ञानं सारभूतो गुण इति विज्ञायते ॥ २९॥

यावदात्मभावित्वाच्च न दोषस्तद्दर्शनात् ॥ ३० ॥

विज्ञानस्य यावदात्मभाविधर्मत्वात्तेन तद्व्यपदेशो न दोषः। तथा च खण्डादयो *यावत्स्वरूपभाविगोत्वादिधर्मशब्देन गौरिति व्यपदिश्यमाना दृश्यन्ते*, स्वरूपनिरूपणधर्मत्वादित्यर्थः। चकाराज्ज्ञानवदात्मनोऽपि स्वप्रकाशत्वेन ज्ञानमिति व्यपदेशे न दोष इति समुच्चिनोति ॥ ३० ॥

[347] यच्चोक्तं सुषुप्त्यादिषु ज्ञानाभावाज्ज्ञानस्य न स्वरूपानुबन्धिधर्मत्वमिति, तत्राह—

'*That is the sole Ānanda of Brahman*' (Tai. 2·8)
'*Knowing the Ānanda of Brahman, he does not fear anywhere*' (Tai. 2·9)

or, as in (the passage)

'*Existence, Knowledge, Infinite Brahman*' (Tai 2·1)

there is a reference by the word Jñāna to the wise one, Prājña. In (passages)

'*With Brahman, the wise one*' (Tai. 2·1)
'*Who, omniscient*' (Mu. 1·1·9)

etc., it is known that Jñāna is the essential quality of the Prājña ॥ 29 ॥

And, (the quality exists), so long as the Ātman exists,—on account of this, there is no fault, on account of that being seen (elsewhere) ॥ 30 ॥

On account of Vijñāna being the attribute as long as the Ātman exists, the reference by that (Vijñāna to the Atman) is no fault. And similarly, the broken-horned etc., are seen being referred to as bull, by the word denoting the attribute bullness etc, existing as long as the nature (of the bull) exists — that is to say, on account of its being the attribute describing its nature. By the use of Ca (and), Ātman also, like Jñāna, being self-illumining, there is no fault in referring (to Ātman) as Jñāna, (the Sūtrakāra) brings in this addition. ॥ 30 ॥

[347] As to what has been said that in the case of deep sleep etc., there is the absence of Jñāna, and so Jñāna is not an attribute persisting in his nature — There says (the Sūtrakāra) —

पुंस्त्वादिवत्त्वस्य सतोभिव्यक्तियोगात् ॥ ३१ ॥

तुशब्दश्चोदिताशङ्कानिवृत्त्यर्थः। अस्य ज्ञानस्य सुषुप्त्यादिष्वपि विद्यमानस्य जागर्यादिष्वभिव्यक्तिसंभवात्स्वरूपानुबन्धिधर्मत्वोपपत्तिः। पुंस्त्वादिवत्। यथा पुंस्त्वाद्यसाधारणस्य धातोर्बाल्यावस्थायां सतोऽप्यनभिव्यक्तस्य युवत्वेऽभिव्यक्तौ पुंस्त्वद्वत्ता न कादाचित्की भवति। सप्तधातुमयत्वं हि शरीरस्य स्वरूपानुबन्धि।

'तत्सप्तधातु त्रिमलं द्वियोनि चतुर्विधाहारमयं शरीरम्।' (गर्भोप. १)

इति शरीरस्वरूपव्यपदेशात्। सुषुप्त्यादिष्वप्यहमर्थः प्रकाशत इति प्रागेवोक्तम्। तस्य विद्यमानस्य ज्ञानस्य विषयगोचरत्वं जागर्यादावुपलभ्यते। एते चात्मनो ज्ञातृत्वादयो धर्माः प्रागेवोपपादिताः। अतो ज्ञातृत्वमेव जीवात्मनः स्वरूपम्। स चायमात्माणुपरिमाणः।

'न प्रेत्य संज्ञास्ति' (बृ. २।४।१२)

इत्यपि न मुक्तस्य ज्ञानाभाव उच्यते, अपि तु

'एतेभ्यो भूतेभ्यः समुत्थाय तान्येवानुविनश्यति' (बृ. २।४।१२)

But on account of the association with the manifestation of the (attribute) existing in this (Ātman), like the virile power etc. ॥ 31 ॥

The word Tu (but) is for the sake of turning away the doubt raised. In the case of this Jñāna existing even in deep sleep etc., there is the possibility of its manifestation in the waking state etc., and so, its being an attribute persisting in its nature is appropriate. Like the (virile) nature of a man etc. — Just as the virile ingredient etc., the essential characteristic of a man, although existing in childhood, is unmanifest, and is manifested in youth, — by this (one cannot say that) being possessed of that virility is only occasional in a man. For, being constituted of the seven basic substances persists in the nature of the body, on account of the nature of the body as pointed out in (the passage) —

'That body has seven basic substances, has three blemishes, two sources, made up of fourfold eatables'. (Garbhopa. 1)

It has already been stated that even in deep sleep etc., the I-entity shines forth. — And his existing consciousness is perceived in the waking state etc., as comprising objects of knowledge. And these attributes of the Ātman, — being the knower etc., have been pointed out already. Therefore, the nature of the Jīvātman is being the knower itself. And that same, this Ātman is atomic in dimension. Even in (the passage)

'No consciousness exists, after departing' (Br 2·4·12)

— is not mentioned the absence of Jñāna in the released Soul; but on the contrary, (what is stated is) that the perception of birth, destruction etc., prompted by something associated with the beings in the state of worldly existence, in (the passage) —

'Having risen up from these elements he perishes after them' (Br. 2·4·12)

इति संसारदशायां यद्भूतानुविधायित्वप्रयुक्तं जन्मनाशादिदर्शनं तन्मुक्तस्य न विद्यते।

'न पश्यो मृत्युं पश्यति न रोगं नोत दुःखताम्।
सर्वं ह पश्यः पश्यति सर्वमाप्नोति सर्वशः ॥' (छा. ७।२६।२)
'नोपजनं स्मरन्निदं शरीरम्' (छा. ८।१२।३)
'मनसैतान्कामान्पश्यन्रमते' (छा. ८।१२।५)

इत्यादिश्रुत्यैकार्थ्यात् ॥ ३१ ॥

[348] संप्रति ज्ञानात्मवादे तस्य सर्वगतत्वे दूषणमाह—

नित्योपलब्ध्यनुपलब्धिप्रसङ्गोऽन्यतरनियमो वान्यथा ॥ ३२ ॥

अन्यथा सर्वगतत्वपक्षे, तस्य ज्ञानमात्रत्वपक्षे च नित्यमुपलब्ध्यनुपलब्धी सहैव प्रसज्येयाताम्, अन्यतरनियमो वा, उपलब्धिरेव वा नित्यं स्यादनुपलब्धिरेव वा। एतदुक्तं भवति—

लोके तावद्वर्तमानयोरात्मोपलब्ध्यनुपलब्ध्योरयं ज्ञानात्मा सर्वगतो हेतुः स्यादुपलब्धेरेव वानुपलब्धेरेव वा। उभयहेतुत्वे सर्वदा सर्वत्रोभयं प्रसज्येत। यद्युपलब्धेरेव, सर्वस्य सर्वदा सर्वत्रानुपलम्भो न स्यात्। अथानुपलब्धेरेव, सर्वदा सर्वत्रोपलब्धिर्न स्यादिति। अस्माकं शरीरस्यान्तरेवावस्थितत्वादात्मनस्तत्रैवोपलब्धिर्नान्यत्रेति व्यवस्थास्थितिः। करणा-

— that does not exist in the case of the released Soul, on account of its having the same sense as in (the passages) —

'*The seer sees not death, nor disease, nor again the nature of misery. The seer, indeed, sees everything and obtains everything everywhere*' (Chā. 7·26·2)
'*Not remembering the birth, this body*' (Chā. 8·12·3)
'*Seeing these desires by the mind, he enjoys*' (Chā. 8·12·5)

॥ 31 ॥

[348] Now, (the Sūtrakāra) speaks of the blemish in the doctrine advocating Jñāna as the Ātman, if he is all pervading —

Otherwise (there would be) the undesirable contingency —, all-time perception and non-perception, or either as a rule. ॥ 32 ॥

Otherwise, according to the doctrine that he is all-pervading, and the doctrine that he is mere consciousness, there would perforce be the perception and non-perception indeed always together, or either as a rule — there would be perception alone always, or non-perception alone. This is what is intended to be said —

In the case of the perception and non-perception of the Atman obtaining for the matter of that in the world, this all-pervading Jñānātman would be the cause of perception alone or of non-perception alone If he were the cause of both, there would perforce be existing both everywhere always; if (Ātman is the cause) of the perception alone, there would not be non-perception of everything, everywhere at any time; if only of non-perception, there would be no perception at any time anywhere As for us, on account of the Atman abiding, verily, within the body, there alone is the perception of that, and not elsewhere — this is the settled arrangement. Even if (the perception is said to

यत्तोपलब्धेरपि सर्वेषामात्मनां सर्वगतत्वेन सर्वैः करणैः सर्वदा संयुक्तत्वाददृष्टादेरप्यनियमादुक्तदोषः समानः ॥ ३२ ॥

ज्ञाधिकरण समाप्तम् (४)

कर्ता शास्त्रार्थवत्त्वात् ॥ ३३ ॥

(अधिकरण ५, सूत्राणि ३३–३९)

[349] अयमात्मा ज्ञाता स चाणुपरिमाण इत्युक्तम्। इदानीं किं स एव कर्ता, उत स्वयमकर्तैव सन्, अचेतनानां गुणानां कर्तृत्वमात्मन्यध्यस्यति ? इति चिन्त्यते। किमत्र युक्तम् ? अकर्तैवात्मेति। कुतः ? आत्मनो ह्यकर्तृत्वं गुणानामेव च कर्तृत्वमध्यात्मशास्त्रेषु श्रूयते। तथाहि-कठवल्लीषु जीवस्य

'न जायते म्रियते'　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(का २।१८)

इत्यादिना जन्मजरामरणादिकं सर्वं प्रकृतिधर्मं प्रतिषिध्य, हननादिषु क्रियासु कर्तृत्वमपि प्रतिषिध्यते

'हन्ता चेन्मन्यते हन्तुं हतश्चेन्मन्यते हतम्।
उभौ तौ न विजानीतो नाय हन्ति न हन्यते ॥'　　　　　(का २।१९)

इति। हन्तारमात्मानं जानन्न जानात्यात्मानमित्यर्थः। तथा च भगवता स्वयमेव जीवस्याकर्तृत्वं

---

be) dependent upon the sense-organs,—because all the Ātmans being all-pervading are conjoint always with all the sense-organs,—the blemish pointed out obtains (there) also, on account of the non-regulation of the Unseen etc. ॥ 32 ॥

Here ends the Jñādhikarana (4)

The Agent, on account of the Śāstra being significant ॥ 33 ॥
(Adhikarana 5, Sūtras 33–39)

[349] *It has been stated that this* Ātman *is the knower, and that he* is atomic in dimension Now, it is considered—Is he alone the agent, or, being himself indeed a non-agent he superimposes upon himself the nature of the agent of the non-sentient qualities ? What (is) proper here ? Atman (is) but a non-agent Whence ? For, it is pointed out in metaphysical works that Ātman is a non-agent and the nature of an agent belongs to the qualities. To explain the same—

In the Katha sections, repudiating all the qualities of the Prakrti, such as birth, old age, death etc, in the case of the Jiva in (the passage) beginning with

'*He is not born nor dies*',　　　　　　　　　(Ka 2·18)

is repudiated the nature of the agent also, in respect of acts such as killing etc, in (the passage)—

'*If the killer thinks of killing, if the killed one thinks (himself as) killed,—both those do not know—this one neither kills, nor is killed*'.　　　　　　　　　(Kā 2·19)

—That is to say—knowing Ātman to be the killer, one does not know the Atman And likewise by the Lord himself personally, has been spoken of

स्वरूपं कर्तृत्वाभिमानस्तु व्यामोह इत्युच्यते।

'प्रकृतेः क्रियमाणानि गुणैः कर्माणि सर्वशः।
अहङ्कारविमूढात्मा कर्ताहमिति मन्यते ॥' (गीता ३।२७)
'नान्यं गुणेभ्यः कर्तारं यदा द्रष्टानुपश्यति।' (गीता १४।१९)
'कार्यकारणकर्तृत्वे हेतुः प्रकृतिरुच्यते।
पुरुषः सुखदुःखानां भोक्तृत्वे हेतुरुच्यते ॥' (गीता १३।२०)

इति च। अतः पुरुषस्य भोक्तृत्वमेव। प्रकृतेरेव तु कर्तृत्वम्।

एवं प्राप्ते, प्रचक्ष्महे— कर्ता शास्त्रार्थवत्त्वात्। आत्मैव कर्ता न गुणाः। कस्मात्? शास्त्रार्थवत्त्वात्। शास्त्राणि हि, यजेत स्वर्गकामः, मुमुक्षुर्ब्रह्मोपासीत, इत्येवमादीनि स्वर्गमोक्षादिफलस्य भोक्तारमेव कर्तृत्वे नियुञ्जते। न ह्यचेतनस्य कर्तृत्वे चेतनो नियुज्यते। शासनाच्च शास्त्रम्, शासनं च प्रवर्तनम्, शास्त्रस्य च प्रवर्तकत्वं बोधजननद्वारेण। अचेतनं च प्रधानं न बोधयितुं शक्यम्। अतः शास्त्राणामर्थवत्त्वं भोक्तुश्चेतनस्यैव कर्तृत्वे भवेत्। तदुक्तम्

'शास्त्रफलं प्रयोक्तरि' (जै सू ३।७।१८)

---

the nature of the Jiva as being the non-agent, and the regarding oneself as an agent as infatuation in

'Karmans on all sides (are) being done by the Gunas of Prakrti, (but) one with mind confounded by Ahamkāra (I-ness) thinks — I (am) the doer' (Gītā 3·27)

'When the Seer perceives no other agent than the Gunas' (Gita 14·19)

and

'Prakrti is spoken of as the cause in respect of the body, sense-organs and the state of the agent; Puruṣa is spoken of as the cause in respect of the nature of the enjoyer of pleasures and miseries'. (Gitā 13·20)

Therefore, the Purusa has the nature of the enjoyer alone, and Prakrti alone has the nature of the agent—

This (prima-facie view) being reached, we say (in reply)—The Agent, on account of the *Sāstra being significant*—Ātman alone is the agent, not the qualities,—How? On account of the Śāstra being significant For, the (passages in the) Sāstras, — one desirous of heaven should sacrifice, one desirous of liberation should meditate on Brahman —these and others assign the nature of an agent to the enjoyer alone of the fruit,—heaven, salvation etc, Not indeed, is a sentient assigned the nature of an agent belonging to the non-sentient, the Sāstra is (so called) because of its Śāsana (ordering), and Sāsana, is—directing (one) to act and the role of a director in the case of Śāstra is through producting knowledge And it is impossible that the non-sentient Pradhāna should enlighten one. Therefore it is only when the enjoyer, a sentient one, is the agent, that the Sāstra can have significance That is stated in (the Sūtra)

'The fruit of the Sāstra goes to the director'

(Jai Su 3 7 18)

इति। यदुक्तम्

'हन्ता चेन्मन्यते' (का. २।१९)

इत्यादिना हननक्रियायामकर्तृत्वमात्मनः श्रूयत इति, तदात्मनो नित्यत्वेन हन्तव्यत्वाभावादुच्यते। यच्च

'प्रकृतेः क्रियमाणानि' (गीता ३।२७)

इत्यादिना गुणानामेव कर्तृत्वं स्मर्यत इति, तत्सांसारिकप्रवृत्तिष्वस्य कर्तृता सत्त्वरजस्तमोगुणसंसर्गकृता, न स्वरूपप्रयुक्तेति प्राप्ताप्राप्तविवेकेन गुणानामेव कर्तृत्वमित्युच्यते। तथा च तत्रैवोच्यते

'कारणं गुणसङ्गोऽस्य सदसद्योनिजन्मसु।' (गीता १३।२१)

इति। तथा तत्रैवात्मनश्च कर्तृत्वमभ्युपेत्योच्यते

'तत्रैवं सति कर्तारमात्मानं केवलं तु यः।
पश्यत्यकृतबुद्धित्वान्न स पश्यति दुर्मतिः॥' (गीता १८।१६)

इति।

'अधिष्ठानं तथा कर्ता करणं च पृथग्विधम्।
विविधा च पृथक्चेष्टा दैवं चैवात्र पञ्चमम्॥' (गीता १८।१४)

As to what has been stated in (the passage)

'If the killer thinks' (Kā. 2·19)

etc., that the Ātman is mentioned as the non-agent in respect of the killing-act,—that is said on account of the absence of (the Ātman) being fit to be killed as the Ātman is eternal. And as to (the statement) that the qualities alone are known in the Smṛti-works to be the agent, in (the passage)

'Of the Prakṛti, being done' (Gītā 3·27)

etc.,—there is the nature of the doer, of this (Ātman) in respect of activities pertaining to the worldly existence, due to the association of qualities, Sattva, Rajas and Tamas, and not prompted by his own nature, and so, it is stated that the qualities alone are the agent, in the light of the discrimination about what is pertinent and what is not pertinent. And similarly it has been stated even there

'Association of this one with the Guṇas (is) the cause of his births in good and bad wombs (families)' (Gītā 13·21)

Similarly, even there is stated, after taking for granted Ātman as the agent—

'There, this being the case, he who perceives the Ātman alone as the agent, with his intellect not (properly) developed,—that one, of wrong ideas, sees not.' (Gītā 18·16)

And when the nature of the Ātman as an agent, being dependent upon (things) beginning with the base and ending with fate in (the passage)—

'The base, likewise the doer, and the means of various kinds, and the manifold several activity; and fate, verily, (is) here the fifth' (Gītā 18·14)

इत्यधिष्ठानादिदैवपर्यन्तसापेक्षे सति, आत्मनः कर्तृत्वे य आत्मानमेव केवलं कर्तारं मन्यते न स पश्यति, इत्यर्थः ॥ ३३ ॥

उपादानाद्विहारोपदेशाच्च ॥ ३४ ॥

'स यथा महाराजः' (बृ २।१।१८)

इति प्रकृत्य

'एवमेवैष एतान्प्राणान्गृहीत्वा स्वे शरीरे यथाकामं परिवर्तते' (बृ २।१।१८)

इति प्राणानामुपादाने विहारे च कर्तृत्वमुपदिश्यते ॥ ३४ ॥

व्यपदेशाच्च क्रियायां न चेन्निर्देशविपर्ययः ॥ ३५ ॥

'विज्ञानं यज्ञं तनुते कर्माणि तनुतेऽपि च ।' (तै २।५)

इति लौकिकवैदिकक्रियासु कर्तृत्वव्यपदेशाच्च कर्ता । विज्ञानशब्देन नात्मनो व्यपदेशोऽपि त्वन्तःकरणस्य बुद्धेरिति चेत्, एवं सति निर्देशविपर्ययः स्यात्, बुद्धेः करणत्वाद्विज्ञानेनेति करणविभक्तिनिर्देशः स्यात् ॥ ३५ ॥

उपलब्धिवदनियमः ॥ ३६ ॥

आत्मनोऽकर्तृत्वे दोष उच्यते । यथात्मनो विभुत्वे

—he who considers the Ātman alone to be the agent, he sees not—this is the sense ॥ 33 ॥

On account of taking hold of, and reference about the sporting. ॥ 34 ॥

With the introduction

'As a great king' (Br. 2 1 18)

in

'In this very way, he, catching hold of these vital airs, moves about at will within his body' (Br 2 1 18)

the nature of the agent is referred to, in the matter of taking hold of the Prānas, and sporting about. ॥ 34 ॥

And on account of the reference (to being the agent) in respect of acts, if (Ātman is) not (the agent), there would be a change in the reference (of that matter) ॥ 35 ॥

And Ātman is the doer on account of the description of (his) being the doer in mundane and Vedic activities in (the passage)—

'Vijñāna spreads the sacrifice and also spreads the Karmans' (Tai 2·5)

If it be argued that there is no reference to Ātman by the word Vijñāna, but to Buddhi, the inner sense-organ — (then our reply is) — If this is the case, there would have been a change in the way the reference is made. Because Buddhi is the instrument, there should have been the pointing out (of that Buddhi) by the instrumental case as Vijñānena (by Vijñāna) ॥ 35 ॥

No rule, like the perception. ॥ 36 ॥

A blemish is pointed out, if Ātman were not to be the agent — Just as it has been pointed out that, in case Ātman were to be all-pervading, there is non-regulation in

'नित्योपलब्ध्यनुपलब्धिप्रसङ्गः' (ब्र. सू. २।३।३२)

इत्यादिनोपलब्धेरनियम उक्तस्तद्वदात्मनोऽकर्तृत्वे प्रकृतेश्च कर्तृत्वे तस्याः सर्वपुरुषसाधारणत्वात्, सर्वाणि कर्माणि सर्वेषां भोगाय स्युः, नैव वा कस्यचित्। आत्मनो विभुत्वाभ्युपगमात्संनिधानमपि सर्वेषामविशिष्टम्। अत एव चान्तःकरणादीनामपि नियमो नोपपद्यते यदायत्ता व्यवस्था स्यात् ॥ ३६ ॥

शक्तिविपर्ययात् ॥ ३७ ॥

बुद्धेः कर्तृत्वे कर्तुरन्यस्य भोक्तृत्वानुपपत्तेः, भोक्तृत्वशक्तिरपि तस्या एव स्यादित्यात्मनो भोक्तृत्वशक्तिर्हीयेत। भोक्तृत्वं च बुद्धेरेव संपद्यत इत्यात्मसद्भावे प्रमाणाभावश्च स्यात्।

'पुरुषोऽस्ति भोक्तृभावात्' (सा. का. १७)

इति हि तेषामभ्युपगमः ॥ ३७ ॥

समाध्यभावाच्च ॥ ३८ ॥

बुद्धेः कर्तृत्वे मोक्षसाधनभूतसमाधावपि सैव कर्त्री स्यात्। स च समाधिः प्रकृतेरन्योऽस्मीत्येवंरूपः। न च प्रकृतेरन्योऽस्मीति प्रकृतिः समाधातुमलम्। अतोऽप्यात्मैव कर्ता ॥ ३८ ॥

नन्वात्मनः कर्तृत्वेऽभ्युपगम्यमाने सर्वदा कर्तृत्वं नोपरमेत, इत्यत्राह—

'(*There would be*) *the undesirable contingency—all-time perception or non-perception*'. (Bra Sū. II. 3·32)

etc.,—like that, if Ātman were not to be the agent, and if Prakṛti were to be the agent,—all Karmans would be there for the enjoyment of all, because that (Prakṛti) would be common to all the Puruṣas; or, not indeed of some one at all. Owing to admitting Ātman to be all-pervading, even his presence is unrestricted to all. For this very reason, no rule even in the case of the inner sense-organ etc., can be reasonable, depending on which there would be the proper adjustment. ‖ 36 ‖

On account of the change of power ‖ 37 ‖

If Buddhi were to be the agent, there being the impossibility of another agent being the enjoyer, even the power of being the enjoyer would belong to it (Buddhi) alone—thus the Ātman would be divested of his power as enjoyer; and because the nature of enjoyer would befall Buddhi alone, there would be the absence of the means of proof regarding the existence of the Atman. For, it is their tenet that

'*Puruṣa exists by virtue of the nature of an enjoyer*'. (Sā. Kā. 17)

‖ 37 ‖

And on account of the absence of the state of concentration ‖ 38 ‖

If Buddhi were to be the agent, it would be the agent even in the Samādhi (state), the means of salvation. And the Samādhi is of the form (of the cognition)—I am other than Prakṛti—and the Prakṛti (entertaining the idea)—I am other than Prakṛti—is not competent to indulge in concentration. Therefore also, the Ātman alone is the agent. ‖ 38 ‖

I say (says the objector)—If it were admitted that the Ātman is the agent, his activity for all time would not cease—To this, (the Sūtrakāra) says—

यथा च तक्षोभयथा ॥ ३९ ॥

वागादिकरणसंपन्नोऽप्यात्मा यदेच्छति तदा करोति, यदा तु नेच्छति तदा न करोति। यथा तक्षा वास्यादिकरणसंनिधानेऽपीच्छानुगुण्येन करोति न करोति च। बुद्धेस्त्वचेतनायाः कर्तृत्वे, तस्या भोगवाञ्छादिनियमकारणाभावात्सर्वदा कर्तृत्वमेव स्यात् ॥ ३९ ॥

कर्त्रधिकरणं समाप्तम् (५)

परात्तु तच्छ्रुतेः ॥४०॥

(अधिकरण ६, सू. ४०–४१)

[350] इदं जीवस्य कर्तृत्वं किं स्वातन्त्र्येण, उत परमात्मायत्तम्? इति। किं प्राप्तम्? स्वातन्त्र्येणेति। परमात्मायत्तत्वे हि विधिनिषेधशास्त्रानर्थक्यं प्रसज्यते। यो हि स्वबुद्ध्या प्रवृत्तिनिवृत्त्यारम्भशक्तः स एव नियोज्यो भवति। अतः स्वातन्त्र्येणास्य कर्तृत्वमिति प्राप्ते, अभिधीयते — परात्तु, इति। तुशब्दः पक्षं व्यावर्तयति। तत्कर्तृत्वमस्य परात्परमात्मन एव हेतोर्भवति। कुतः? श्रुतेः —

'अन्तः प्रविष्टः शास्ता जनानां सर्वात्मा' (तै. आ. ३।११।२)

'य आत्मनि तिष्ठन्नात्मनोऽन्तरो यमात्मा न वेद यस्यात्मा शरीरं य आत्मानमन्तरो यमयति स त आत्मान्तर्याम्यमृतः' (बृ. ३।७।२२)

And as the carpenter in both ways. ॥ 39 ॥

The Ātman, although endowed with the sense-organs—Vāk (Speech) etc., acts when he wishes, but does not act when he wishes not; just as a carpenter even when the tools, axe etc., are near, acts or does not act, according to his will. But, if the non-sentient Buddhi were to be the agent, there is bound to be activity for all time, on account of the absence of any regulating cause such as desire for enjoyment, etc. ॥ 39 ॥

Here ends the Kartradhikaraṇa (5)

But that from the Highest, on account of the Śruti ॥ 40 ॥

(Adhikarana 6, Sūtras 40–41)

[350] Is this activity of the Jīva independent, or dependent upon the Paramātman? *What is reached (as the prima-facie view)?* —*Independent*. If (the activity) were to depend upon the Paramātman, the Śāstra-passages dealing with injunctions and prohibitions would perforce be useless. For, he who is competent to begin or refrain from an activity by his own will—he alone is fit to be enjoined. Therefore, his is an independent activity.—This (prima-facie view) being reached, it is stated (in reply)—But from the Highest. The word Tu turns away the (preceding) view. That activity of his is there—Parāt—from the Paramātman alone, the cause. Whence? On account of the Śruti (passages)—

'Entered within, director of people, Ātman of all' (Tai. Ā. 3·11·2)

'Who, abiding in the Ātman, within the Ātman; whom the Ātman knows not, whose body is the Ātman; who controls the Ātman within—that is your Ātman, the inner Controller, immortal.' (Bṛ. 3·7·

इति। स्मृतिरपि

'सर्वस्य चाहं हृदि संनिविष्टो मत्तः स्मृतिर्ज्ञानमपोहनं च।' (गीता १५।१५)

'ईश्वरः सर्वभूतानां हृद्देशेऽर्जुन तिष्ठति।
भ्रामयन्सर्वभूतानि यन्त्रारूढानि मायया॥' (गीता १८।६१)

इति ॥ ४० ॥

[351] नन्वेवं विधिनिषेधशास्त्रानर्थक्यं प्रसज्येतेत्युक्तम्, तत्राह—

कृतप्रयत्नापेक्षस्तु विहितप्रतिषिद्धावैयर्थ्यादिभ्यः ॥ ४१ ॥

सर्वासु क्रियासु पुरुषेण कृतं प्रयत्नमुद्योगमपेक्ष्यान्तर्यामी परमात्मा तदनुमतिदानेन प्रवर्तयति। परमात्मानुमतिमन्तरेणास्य प्रवृत्तिर्नोपपद्यते, इत्यर्थः। कुत एतत्? विहितप्रतिषिद्धा-वैयर्थ्यादिभ्यः। आदिशब्देनानुग्रहनिग्रहादयो गृह्यन्ते। यथा द्वयोः साधारणे धने परस्वत्वा-पादनमन्यतरानुमतिमन्तरेण नोपपद्यते, तथापीतरानुमतिः स्वेनैव कृतेति तत्फलं स्वस्यैव भवति। पापकर्मसु निवर्तनशक्तस्याप्यनुमन्तृत्वं न निर्दयत्वमावहतीति सांख्यसमयनिरूपणे प्रतिपादितम्।

नन्वेवम्

Also the Smrti (says the same thing)—

'And I am well-seated in the heart of all, from me (come forth) memory, knowledge and exclusion' (Gītā 15 15)

'Īsvara abides, (O) Arjuna, in the heart-region of all beings, making all beings (as though) mounted on a machine, whirl about by Māyā'. (Gītā 18·61)

॥ 40 ॥

[351] I say (says the objector)—It has been said (by me) that there would perforce be the uselessness of the Sāstra-passages dealing with injunctions and prohibitions—There (the Sūtrakāra) says—

But (Īśvara) is dependent upon the effort made, so that there would not be uselessness of injunctions and prohibitions etc. ॥ 41 ॥

In respect of all activities, Paramātman, the inner Controller, makes (the Purusa) act, by granting him permission, taking into account the effort, labour gone through by the Purusa. This is the sense — Without the permission of the Paramātman, his activity would not be forthcoming. Whence this? Vihitapratisiddhā-vaiyarthyādibhyah—(So that the thing enjoined and the thing prohibited etc would not be useless) By the word Ādi are to be understood, favour, control etc. Just as when two are sharing wealth, the taking over of what belongs to another, is not possible without the consent of the other, still because the consent of the other (practically) is his own act, the fruit thereof belongs to him alone Giving the consent even by one who is competent to dissuade one from a sinful act, does not amount to his being merciless — This has been propounded in the exposition of the Sānkhya doctrine.

I say (says the objector) — Thus (what is stated) in (the passage)

'एष ह्येव साधु कर्म कारयति तं यमेभ्यो लोकेभ्य उन्निनीषति। एष एवासाधु कर्म कारयति तं यमधो निनीषति' (कौ ३।९)

इत्युन्निनीषयाधोनिनीषया च स्वयमेव साध्वसाधुनी कर्मणी कारयतीति, तन्नोपपद्यते। उच्यते— एतन्न सर्वसाधारणम्। यस्त्वतिमात्रपरमपुरुषानुकूल्ये व्यवस्थितः प्रवर्तते तमनुगृह्णन्भगवान्स्वयमेव स्वप्राप्त्युपायेष्वतिकल्याणेषु कर्मस्वेव रुचिं जनयति। यश्चातिमात्रप्रातिकूल्ये व्यवस्थितः प्रवर्तते तं स्वप्राप्तिविरोधिष्वधोगतिसाधनेषु कर्मसु रुचिं जनयति। यथोक्तं भगवता स्वयमेव

'अहं सर्वस्य प्रभवो मत्तः सर्वं प्रवर्तते।
इति मत्वा भजन्ते मां बुधा भावसमन्विताः॥' (गीता १०।८)

इत्यारभ्य

'तेषां सततयुक्तानां भजतां प्रीतिपूर्वकम्।
ददामि बुद्धियोगं तं येन मामुपयान्ति ते॥
तेषामेवानुकम्पार्थमहमज्ञानजं तमः।
नाशयाम्यात्मभावस्थो ज्ञानदीपेन भास्वता॥' (गीता १०।१०-११)

इति। तथा

'असत्यमप्रतिष्ठं ते जगदाहुरनीश्वरम्।' (गीता १६।८)

'This one alone makes one perform a good act, whom he wishes to lift up from these worlds, this one alone makes one perform an evil act, whom he wishes to go down' (Kau 3 9)

—(that the Lord) alone himself makes one do good and bad deeds, with a desire to lift him up or to throw him down,—this does not stand to reason—(This) is stated (in reply)—This (is) not (a statement) applicable to all But he who is extremely well established in the favour of the Highest Puruṣa acts the divine one himself, of his own accord, favouring him, creates love (in him) for only those extremely auspicious acts which are the means to attain to him And for him who is extremely firmly established in his disfavour He creates love for acts opposed to the attainment to Him, which are the means of the downward course As has been said by the Lord himself in beginning with—

'I am the source of all, from Me proceeds forth everything —knowing this, wise men endowed with devotion resort to Me' (Gītā 10 8)

'To them, ever devoted, worshipping (Me) with affection, I give that Yoga of understanding by which they come to Me.

For the sake of (showing) compassion to them alone, I abiding in (their) soul-state, destroy the darkness produced from ignorance, by the refulgent knowledge-lamp' (Gītā 10 10–11)

etc. Similarly, having stated, beginning with

'They speak of (describe) the world as unreal (coming from Asat) without foundation, without any Controller' (Gītā 16 8)

इत्यादि

'मामात्मपरदेहेषु प्रद्विषन्तोऽभ्यसूयकाः ।' (गीता १६।१८)

इत्यन्तमुक्त्वा

'तानहं द्विषतः क्रूरान्संसारेषु नराधमान् ।
क्षिपाम्यजस्रमशुभानासुरीष्वेव योनिषु ॥' (गीता १६।१९)

इत्युक्तम् ॥ ४१ ॥

परायत्ताधिकरणं समाप्तम् (६)

अंशो नानाव्यपदेशादन्यथा चापि दाशकितवादित्वमधीयत एके ॥ ४२ ॥

(अधिकरण ७, सूत्राणि ४२–५२)

[352] जीवस्य कर्तृत्वं परमपुरुषायत्तमित्युक्तम् । इदानीं—किमयं जीवः परस्मादत्यन्तभिन्नः, उत परमेव ब्रह्म भ्रान्तम्, उत ब्रह्मैवोपाध्यवच्छिन्नम्, अथ ब्रह्मांशः? इति संशय्यते । श्रुतिविप्रतिपत्तेः संशयः—ननु

'तदनन्यत्वमारम्भणशब्दादिभ्यः' (ब्र. सू. २।१।१५)

'अधिकं तु भेदनिर्देशात्' (ब्र. सू. २।१।२२)

इत्यत्रैवायमर्थो निर्णीतः । सत्यम् । स एव नानात्वैकत्वश्रुतिविप्रतिपत्त्याक्षिप्य जीवस्य ब्रह्मां-

---

etc., and ending with

'*And those envying me and hating me in the body of themselves and of others.*' (Gītā 16·18)

it is stated

'*Those merciless haters (enemies), the meanest of men in worldly lives, I throw unceasingly those unholy ones into the Āsura-wombs.*' (Gītā 16·19)

॥ 42 ॥

Here ends the Parāyattādhikaraṇa (6)

A portion of Brahman, on account of being designated as manifold, and also otherwise; some read (his) being possessed of the state of fishermen, gamblers etc. ॥ 42 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 7, Sūtras 42–52)

[352] It has been said, that Jīva's being the agent is dependent upon the Highest Puruṣa. Now a doubt is raised—Is this Jīva absolutely different from the Highest, or is he the Highest Brahman itself infatuated, or Brahman itself characterised by limiting adjuncts, or a portion of Brahman?—The doubt is due to the conflicting Śrutis (in this respect). I say (says the objector)—in (the Sūtras),

'*There is the non-different nature on account of the words Ārambhaṇa etc.*' (Bra. Sū. II. 1·15)

'*But more (in addition), on account of the reference as different*' (Bra. Sū. II. 1·22)

this matter has been decided here itself — (We reply) True, that same is decided in particular by declaring the Jīva to be a portion of Brahman, after having objected to it on the strength of the conflict between the Sruti (passages)

शत्वोपपादनेन विशेषतो निर्णीयते। यावद्धि जीवस्य ब्रह्मांशत्वं न निर्णीतं तावज्जीवस्य ब्रह्मणोऽनन्यत्वं ब्रह्मणस्तस्मादधिकत्वं च न प्रतितिष्ठति। किं तावत्प्राप्तम् ? अत्यन्तभिन्न इति। कुतः ?

'ज्ञाज्ञौ द्वावजौ' (श्वे १।९)

इत्यादिना भेदनिर्देशात्। ज्ञाज्ञयोरभेदश्रुतयस्तु,— अग्निना सिञ्चेत्— इतिवद्विरुद्धार्थप्रतिपादनादौपचारिक्यः। ब्रह्मणोऽंशो जीव', इत्यपि न साधीयः। एकवस्त्वेकदेशवाची ह्यंशशब्दः। जीवस्य ब्रह्मैकदेशत्वे तद्गता दोषा ब्रह्मणि भवेयुः। न च ब्रह्मखण्डो जीवः, इत्यंशत्वोपपत्तिः, खण्डनानर्हत्वाद्ब्रह्मणः, प्रागुक्तदोषप्रसङ्गाच्च। तस्मादत्यन्तभिन्नस्य च तदंशत्वं दुरुपपादम्।

यद्वा भ्रान्तं ब्रह्मैव जीवः। कुतः ?

'तत्त्वमसि' (छा ६।८।७)

'अयमात्मा ब्रह्म' (बृ २।५।१९)

इत्यादिब्रह्मात्मभावोपदेशात्। नानात्ववादिन्यस्तु प्रत्यक्षादिसिद्धार्थानुवादित्वात्, अनन्यथासिद्धाद्वैतोपदेशपराभिः श्रुतिभिः प्रत्यक्षादय इवाविद्यान्तर्गताः ख्याप्यन्ते।

अथ वा ब्रह्मैवानाद्युपाध्यवच्छिन्नं जीवः। कुतः ? तत एव ब्रह्मात्मभावोपदेशात्। न चायमुपाधिर्भ्रान्तिपरिकल्पित इति वक्तुं शक्यम्, बन्धमोक्षादिव्यवस्थानुपपत्तेरिति।

referring to (Jiva's) being manifold and (his) being one, for, so long as it has not been decided that Jiva is a portion of Brahman, Jiva's being not different from Brahman, and Brahman's being over and above that, would not stand What, for the matter of that, is (the prima-facie view) reached ? Absolutely different. Whence ? On account of the pointing out to the difference in

'*The knower and the non-knower, the two unborn*' (Śve 1 9)

etc — The Sruti passages mentioning the non-difference between the knower and the non-knower are secondary in sense, on account of their putting forth contradictory views, like — one sprinkles by the fire (The view) that the Jiva is a portion of Brahman, also cannot be justified, for, the word Amśa denotes a part of an object If Jīva is a part of Brahman, blemishes belonging to him would exist in Brahman Nor again is to be accounted for, the state of being a portion, because Jiva is a cut off portion of Brahman on account of Brahman being incapable of being cut into, and on account of the blemishes spoken of before intruding Therefore, (in respect of Jiva) totally different from Brahman, his being a portion of that (Brahman) is difficult to sustain.

Or, Jiva is Brahman itself in a state of infatuation. Whence ? On account of the instruction about Brahman being the Ātman in (passages)

'*That thou art*' (Chā 6 8 7)

'*This Ātman (is) Brahman*' (Br. 2 5 19)

etc — As to (the Srutis) mentioning manifoldness, they are declared as being within the fold of Avidyā by Sruti-passages giving instruction about non-duality not proved otherwise, like Direct perception etc, on account of their merely repeating the matter proved by Direct perception etc.

Or, Jiva is Brahman itself characterised by beginningless limiting adjuncts Whence ? On account of the instruction about the Brahman being the Ātman, for that very reason. Nor again, is it possible to say that this limiting adjunct is imagined by infatuation, on account of the impossibility of the regulated arrangement about bondage and salvation,

[353] एवं प्राप्ते, अभिधीयते—

ब्रह्मांश इति। कुतः? नानात्वव्यपदेशात्। अन्यथा च, एकत्वेन व्यपदेशात्। उभयथा हि व्यपदेशो दृश्यते। नानात्वव्यपदेशस्तावत्स्रष्टृत्वसृज्यत्व-नियन्तृत्वनियाम्यत्व-सर्वज्ञत्वाज्ञत्वस्वाधीनत्वपराधीनत्व-शुद्धत्वाशुद्धत्व-कल्याणगुणाकरत्व-तद्विपरीतत्व-पतित्वशेषत्वादिभिर्दृश्यते। अन्यथा चाभेदेन व्यपदेशोऽपि

'तत्त्वमसि' (छा. ६।८।७)

'अयमात्मा ब्रह्म' (बृ. २।५।१९)

इत्यादिभिर्दृश्यते। अपि दाशकितवादित्वमधीयत एके—

'ब्रह्म दाशा ब्रह्म दासा ब्रह्मेमे कितवाः' (आथर्वण सूक्त)

इत्याथर्वणिका ब्रह्मणो दाशकितवादित्वमप्यधीयते। ततश्च सर्वजीवव्यापित्वेनाभेदो व्यपदिश्यत इत्यर्थः। एवमुभयव्यपदेशमुख्यत्वसिद्धये जीवोऽयं ब्रह्मणोंऽश इत्यभ्युपगन्तव्यः। न च भेदव्यपदेशानां प्रत्यक्षादिप्रसिद्धार्थत्वेनान्यथासिद्धत्वम्। ब्रह्मसृज्यत्वतन्नियाम्यत्वतच्छरीरत्वतच्छेषत्वतदाधारत्वतत्पाल्यत्वतत्संहार्यत्वतदुपासकत्वतत्प्रसादलभ्यधर्मार्थकाममोक्षरूपपुरुषार्थ-

---

[353] This (prima-facie view) being reached, it is stated (*in reply*)—

A portion of Brahman. Whence? On account of the mention of (his) nature as many. Anyathā ca—and on account of the mention as being one, for, the reference is seen as being both ways. The reference as being many, for the matter of that, is seen by (the mention of) being the creator, being fit to be created, being the controller, being liable to control; being omniscient, being ignorant, being self-dependent, being dependent upon another, being pure, being impure; being the mine of auspicious qualities, being the opposite of that; being the master, being the subordinate etc.— And also otherwise, the reference as being not different is also seen in (passages)

'*That thou art*' (Chā 6 8 7)

'*This Ātman, (is) Brahman*' (Br 2·5·19)

etc. Also, some read the Jiva being fishermen, gamblers etc The students of the *Atharvana* read Brahman being fishermen, gamblers etc as well, in the (passages)

'*Brahman, fishermen; Brahman, slaves, Brahman, these gamblers*' (Ātharvana Sūkta)

—That is to say, from that is pointed out non-difference owing to (Brahman) *pervading all Jivas* Thus, *this Jiva ought to be admitted* as a portion of Brahman, in order that this twofold reference could be proved to be in the primary sense Nor again, are the difference-references proved otherwise, on account of the matter being established by Direct perception etc Being fit to be created by Brahman, being fit to be controlled by it (Brahman), being its body, being its subordinate, having it for his support, being its ward, being fit to be withdrawn by it, being its worshipper, being the enjoyer of the fourfold human purpose in life, constituted of Dharma, Artha, Kāma, and Moksa, that are to be secured by its grace, etc,—and the difference caused by that, between Jīva and Brahman, are not proved otherwise, on account of their not coming

भाक्त्वादयस्तत्कृतश्च जीवब्रह्मणोर्भेदः प्रत्यक्षाद्यगोचरत्वेनानन्यथासिद्धः। अतो न जगत्सृष्ट्यादिवादिनीनां प्रमाणान्तरसिद्धभेदानुवादेन मिथ्यार्थोपदेशपरत्वम्। न चाखण्डैकरसचिन्मात्रस्वरूपेण ब्रह्मणात्मनोऽतद्भावानुसंधानं बहुभवनसंकल्पपूर्वकवियदादिसृष्टिं जीवभावेन तत्प्रवेशं विचित्रनामरूपव्याकरणं तत्कृतानन्तविषयानुभवनिमित्तसुखदुःखभागित्वमभोक्तृत्वेन तत्र स्थित्वा, तन्नियमनेनान्तर्यामित्वं जीवभूतस्य स्वस्य कारणब्रह्मात्मभावानुसंधानं संसारमोक्षं तदुपदेशशास्त्रं च कुर्वाणेन भ्रमितव्यमित्युपदिश्यते, तथा सत्युन्मत्तप्रलपितत्वापातात्।

उपाध्यवच्छिन्नं ब्रह्म जीव इत्यपि न साधीयः, पूर्वनिर्दिष्टनियन्तृत्वनियाम्यत्वादिव्यपदेशाभावादेव। न हि देवदत्तादेरेकस्यैव गृहाद्युपाधिभेदान्नियन्तृनियाम्यभावादिसिद्धिः। अत उभयव्यपदेशोपपत्तये जीवोऽयं ब्रह्मणोऽश इत्यभ्युपेत्यम् ॥ ४२ ॥

[354]　　　　मन्त्रवर्णात् ॥ ४३ ॥

'पादोऽस्य विश्वा भूतानि त्रिपादस्यामृतं दिवि।'　　(तै आ. ३।१०)

इति मन्त्रवर्णाच्च ब्रह्मांशो जीवः। अंशवाची हि पादशब्दः। विश्वा भूतानि, इति जीवानां

---

within the province of Direct perception etc Therefore (the Sruti-passages) advocating the creation of the world are not aiming at instructing about something false, on account of their repeating the difference proved by other means of proof. Nor again, can it be declared that Brahman was under an illusion, (infatuation)—Brahman having an unbroken uniform pure consciousness as its nature, bringing about the connection of the Ātman with a nature other than that, the creation, sky etc, preceded by the thought as to being manifold, entrance into the same in the form of Jiva, the modification in various names and forms, the sharing of happiness, misery caused by the experience of endless objects of sense caused by that (modification) having stayed there, not as an enjoyer, being the inner Controller owing to its checking that (Jiva) and ensuring its own persistence as the cause Brahman, existing as Jiva and effecting release from Samsāra, and being responsible for the Sāstra giving instructions about that—If that were the case, this would amount to the ravings of a madman!

(The idea) that Brahman circumscribed by the limiting adjuncts is the Jiva, cannot be proved either, on account of the presence itself of the reference to being the controller, being fit to be controlled etc, mentioned before Not indeed, in the case of one and the same Devadatta, is the establishment of the nature of the controller and the controlled etc, on account of the different limiting adjuncts, house etc Therefore, in order to account for the twofold reference it should be admitted that this Jiva is a portion of Brahman || 42 ||

[354] On account of the Mantra passage. || 43 ||

And on account of the *Mantra*-passage—

'*One foot of his is all beings, his three feet immortal in heaven*'　　(Tai Ā. 3·10)

Jiva is a portion of Brahman, for, the word Pāda is denotative of a portion The plural number (in the passage) Visvā Bhūtani (all beings) is there on

बहुत्वाद्बहुवचनं मन्त्रे। सूत्रेऽप्यंश इत्येकवचनं जात्यभिप्रायम्।

'नात्मा श्रुतेः' (ब्र. सू. २।३।१८)

इत्यत्राप्येकवचनं जात्यभिप्रायम्।

'नित्यो नित्यानां चेतनश्चेतनानामेको बहूनां यो विदधाति कामान्।' (श्वे. ६।१३)

इत्यादिश्रुतिभ्य ईश्वराद्भेदस्यात्मनां बहुत्वनित्यत्वयोश्चाभिधीयमानत्वात्। एवं नित्यानामात्मनां बहुत्वे प्रामाणिके सति ज्ञानस्वरूपत्वेन सर्वेषामेकरूपत्वेऽपि भेदकाकार आत्मयाथात्म्यवेदनक्षमैरवगम्यते।

'असंततेश्चाव्यतिकरः' (ब्र. सू. २।३।४८)

इत्यनन्तरमेव चात्मबहुत्वं वक्ष्यति ॥ ४३ ॥

अपि स्मर्यते ॥ ४४ ॥

'ममैवांशो जीवलोके जीवभूतः सनातनः।' (गीता १५।७)

इति जीवस्य पुरुषोत्तमांशत्वं स्मर्यते। अतश्चायमंशः ॥ ४४ ॥

अंशत्वेऽपि जीवस्य ब्रह्मैकदेशत्वेन जीवगता दोषा ब्रह्मण एव, इत्याशङ्क्याह —

प्रकाशादिवत्तु नैवं परः ॥ ४५ ॥

---

account of the Jivas being many. The singular number in the Sūtra also, Amśaḥ, is intended to refer to the universal. The singular number in

'Not the Ātman, on account of the Śruti' (Bra Sū. II·3·18)

is here also intended to refer to the universal (genus), on account of the difference from Īśvara and the Ātmans also being many and eternal, being mentioned in the Śruti (passages) such as

'Eternal among the eternals, sentient among the sentients, one among many, who lays down the desires'. (Śve. 6·13)

In this manner, when the (fact of the) eternal Ātmans being many, is backed by means of proof, although all of them are uniform, by having the nature of consciousness, their distinguishing form is apprehended by those competent to know the nature as it is of Ātman. Immediately afterwards (the Sūtrakāra) would mention the Ātmans being many, in (the Sūtra)

'And on account of non-connection (there is) no commingling' (Bra. Sū. II. 3·48)

॥ 43 ॥

It is also stated in the Smṛti ॥ 44 ॥

'My own eternal portion, verily, having become the Individual Soul in the world of mortals'. (Gītā 15 7)

— (In this passage) it is stated by the Smṛti that Jīva is a portion of Purusottama. And therefore, this (Jiva is) a portion ॥ 44 ॥

Though Jiva is a portion (of Brahman), the blemishes belonging to the Jiva belong to Brahman itself, owing to his being a portion of Brahman — Raising this doubt (the Sūtrakāra) says —

But like light etc., not so (is) the Highest ॥ 45 ॥

[355] तुशब्दश्चोद्यं व्यावर्तयति। प्रकाशादिवज्जीवः परमात्मनोऽशः। यथा, अग्न्यादित्यादेर्भास्वतो भारूपः प्रकाशोऽशो भवति, यथा गवाश्वशुक्लकृष्णादीनां गोत्वादिविशिष्टानां वस्तूनां गोत्वादीनि विशेषणान्यंशाः, यथा वा देहिनो देवमनुष्यादेर्देहोंऽशस्तद्वत्। एकवस्त्वेकदेशत्वं ह्यंशत्वम्। विशिष्टस्यैकस्य वस्तुनो विशेषणमंश एव। तथा च विवेचका विशिष्टे वस्तुनि विशेषणांशोऽयं विशेष्यांशोऽयमिति व्यपदिशन्ति। विशेषणविशेष्ययोरंशांशित्वेऽपि स्वभाववैलक्षण्यं दृश्यते। एवं जीवपरयोर्विशेषणविशेष्ययोरंशांशित्वं स्वभावभेदश्चोपपद्यते। तदिदमुच्यते नैवं परः, इति। यथाभूतो जीवो न तथाभूतः परः। यथैव हि प्रभायाः प्रभावानन्यथाभूतः, तथा प्रभास्थानीयात्स्वांशाज्जीवादंशी परोऽप्यर्थान्तरभूत इत्यर्थः। एवं जीवपरयोर्विशेषणविशेष्यत्वकृतं स्वभाववैलक्षण्यमाश्रित्य भेदनिर्देशाः प्रवर्तन्ते। अभेदनिर्देशास्तु पृथक्सिद्ध्यनर्हविशेषणानां विशेष्यपर्यन्तत्वमाश्रित्य मुख्यत्वेनोपपद्यन्ते।

'तत्त्वमसि' (छा ६।८।७)

'अयमात्मा ब्रह्म' (बृ. २।५।१९)

इत्यादिषु तच्छब्दब्रह्मशब्दवत्त्वमयमात्मेति शब्दा अपि जीवशरीरकब्रह्मवाचकत्वेनैकार्थाभिधायित्वादिति। अयमर्थः प्रागेव प्रपञ्चितः ॥ ४५ ॥

---

[355] The word Tu (but) turns away the objection Like light etc, Jiva is a portion of the Paramātman,—as for instance, the light in the form of refulgence is a portion of the refulgent fire, the Sun etc, as for instance, the attributes, bullness etc, are part and parcel of entities particularised by bullness etc—bull horse, white, dark etc, or as for instance, the body is the portion of the embodied gods, men etc,—like that. For, being a portion means existing in a part of one object. The attribute of a qualified entity is but a portion of it And so, discriminating people point out in the case of a qualified entity—This is the attribute-portion, this (is) a portion—the thing qualified Even though the qualifying attribute and the qualified have the relation of part and whole, there is seen difference in their natures In the same way, in the case of the Jiva and the Highest—the attribute and the qualified—is appropriate the relation of part and whole, and the difference in nature All this is said (by the Sūtrakāra in the Sūtra-portion) Not so, (is) the Highest. As the Jiva is, not like that, the Highest,—that is to say, just as, indeed the lustre is different from the lustrous, in the same way from the Jiva, his portion, corresponding to the lustre, (is) the Highest, the whole, a different entity Thus, references pertaining to the difference become current, resorting to the difference in nature caused by the relation of the attribute and the qualified, in the case of the Jiva and the Highest The references to non-difference, on the other hand, are appropriate in the primary sense, pertaining to the attributes not fit for staying separately culminating into the thing qualified, because like the word Tat and the word Brahman in (the passages)—

'That thou art' (Chā 6 8 7)

'This Ātman, Brahman' (Br 2 5 19)

etc, the words Tvam, Ayam Atmā also denote the same sense, being denotative of Brahman with Jiva as its body This matter has already been dealt with in detail ॥ 45 ॥

स्मरन्ति च ॥ ४६ ॥

एवं प्रभाप्रभावद्रूपेण शक्तिशक्तिमद्रूपेण शरीरात्मभावेन चांशांशिभावं जगद्ब्रह्मणोः पराशरादयः स्मरन्ति—

'एकदेशस्थितस्याग्नेर्ज्योत्स्ना विस्तारिणी यथा ।
परस्य ब्रह्मणः शक्तिस्तथेदमखिलं जगत् ॥' (वि पु १।२२।५५)

'यत्किञ्चित्सृज्यते येन सत्त्वजातेन वै द्विज ।
तस्य सृज्यस्य सम्भूतौ तत्सर्वं वै हरेस्तनुः ॥' (वि पु १।२२।३७)

इत्यादिना । चकाराच्छ्रुतयोऽपि

'यस्यात्मा शरीरम्' (बृ ३।७।२२)

इत्यादिनात्मशरीरभावेनांशांशित्वं वदन्ति, इत्युच्यते ॥ ४६ ॥

[356] एवं ब्रह्मणोंऽशत्वे ब्रह्मप्रवर्त्यत्वे ज्ञत्वे च सर्वेषां समाने केषांचिद्वेदाध्ययनतदर्थानुष्ठानाद्यनुज्ञा, केषांचित्तत्परिहारः, केषांचिद्दर्शनस्पर्शनाद्यनुज्ञा, केषांचित्तत्परिहारश्च शास्त्रेषु कथमुपपद्यते ? इत्याशङ्क्याह—

अनुज्ञापरिहारौ देहसंबन्धाज्ज्योतिरादिवत् ॥ ४७ ॥

And the Smrtis (say the same) ॥ 46 ॥

In this way Parāsara and others refer in the Smrti-works to the relation of part and whole, of the world and Brahman, as being of the form of the lustre and the lustrous one, of the form of power and the powerful one, and being the body and the Ātman—

'As there is the pervading light of fire abiding in one place, so this entire world is the power of the Highest Brahman' (V. P. 1·22·55)

'Whatever is created involving the aggregate of creatures, (O) Twice-born (Brāhmana,) when the creation comes into existence — all that, verily, (is) the body of Hari' (V. P. 1·22·37)

etc., — By the word Ca (in the Sūtra), it is stated that the Sruti-passages

'Whose body, the Ātman' (Br. 3 7·22)

etc, also speak of the relation of the part and whole, due to the relation of the Ātman and the body. ॥ 46 ॥

[356] In this way, when being the portion of Brahman, being the servant of Brahman, and being the knower (are) common to all — permission in respect of the study of the Vedas, and the ritual thereof, in the case of some, and prohibition of the same in the case of others, permission in the case of some, for the sight and touch, and the prohibition of the same in the case of some in the Sāstras—How is (all this) to be reconciled ?—Raising this doubt, (the Sūtrakāra) says—

Permission and prohibition from the relation with the body, like the flame etc, ॥ 47 ॥

सर्वेषां ब्रह्मांशत्वज्ञातृत्वादिनैकरूपत्वे सत्यपि ब्राह्मणक्षत्रियवैश्यशूद्रादिरूपशुच्यशुचिदेहसंबन्धनिबन्धनावनुज्ञापरिहारावुपपद्येते। ज्योतिरादिवत् — यथा, अग्नेरग्नित्वेनैकरूपत्वेऽपि श्रोत्रियागारादग्निराह्रियते श्मशानादेस्तु परिह्रियते, यथा चान्नादि श्रोत्रियादेरनुज्ञायतेऽभिशस्तादेस्तु परिह्रियते ॥ ४७ ॥

असंततेश्चाव्यतिकरः ॥ ४८ ॥

ब्रह्मांशत्वादिनैकरूपत्वे सत्यपि जीवानामन्योन्यभेदादणुत्वेन प्रतिशरीरं भिन्नत्वाच्च भोगव्यतिकरोऽपि न भवति। भ्रान्तब्रह्मजीववादे चोपहितब्रह्मजीववादे च जीवपरयोर्जीवानां च भोगव्यतिकरादयः सर्वे दोषाः सन्ति, इत्यभिप्रायेण स्वपक्षे भोगव्यतिकराभाव उक्तः ॥ ४८ ॥

[357] ननु भ्रान्तब्रह्मजीववादेऽप्यविद्याकृतोपाधिभेदाद्भोगव्यवस्थादय उपपद्यन्ते, अत आह —

आभास एव च ॥ ४९ ॥

अखण्डैकरसप्रकाशमात्रस्वरूपस्य स्वरूपतिरोधानपूर्वकोपाधिभेदोपपादनहेतुः, आभास

Although all are possessed of a uniform nature, in being a portion of Brahman, being the knower etc., permission and prohibition are appropriate depending upon association with bodies,—pure and impure, in the form of Brāhmaṇa, Ksatriya, Vaiśya, Śūdra etc.—Like the flame etc.—Just as though fire is of a uniform nature as fire, the fire from the fire-sanctuary of a learned Agnihotrin is taken; but the fire from the cemetery etc., is avoided; just as food etc., from a learned Brāhmaṇa etc , are permitted, but from a low caste fellow, etc., are prohibited. ॥ 47 ॥

On account of non-connection, (there is) no commingling ॥ 48 ॥

Although the Jīvas are possessed of a uniform nature in being the portion of Brahman etc., there would not be commingling either of enjoyment, on account of their being mutually different, and being different for each body, owing to their being atomic. In the doctrine advocating Jīva as being Brahman infatuated, and in the doctrine advocating Jīva as Brahman circumscribed (by the limiting adjuncts), there would be all the blemishes like the commingling of the enjoyments in the case of the Highest and the Jīva, and among the Jīvas—Bearing this in mind, the absence of the commingling of the enjoyment according to his own view has been spoken (by the Sūtrakāra). ॥ 48 ॥

[357] I say (says the objector)—Even in the doctrine advocating Jīva as being Brahman infatuated, regulated arrangement about enjoyment etc., would be there on account of the defference of the limiting adjuncts caused by Avidyā.—So, (the Sūtrakāra) says (in reply to this)—

And (the Hetu) only a fallacy. ॥ 49 ॥

In the case of an entity having only unruffled and uniform light as its nature, the logical mark propounding the difference in the *limiting* adjuncts preceded by the screening of its nature, is but a fallacy. It has already

एव। प्रकाशैकस्वरूपस्य प्रकाशतिरोधानं प्रकाशनाश एवेति प्रागेवोपपादितम्।
आभासा एव, इति वा पाठः। तथा सति हेतव आभासाः। चकारात्
'पृथगात्मानं प्रेरितारं च मत्वा' (श्वे. १।६)
'ज्ञाज्ञौ द्वावजावीशानीशौ' (श्वे. १।९)
'तयोरन्यः पिप्पलं स्वाद्वत्ति' (मु. ३।१।१, श्वे. ४।६)
इत्यादिश्रुतिविरोधश्च। अविद्यापरिकल्पितोपाधिभेदे हि सर्वोपाधिभिरुपहितस्वरूपकस्यैकत्वाभ्युपगमाद्भोगव्यतिकरस्तदवस्थ एव ॥ ४९ ॥

[358] पारमार्थिकोपाध्युपहितब्रह्मजीववादेऽपि, उपाधिभेदहेतुभूतानाद्यदृष्टवशाद्व्यवस्था भविष्यति, इत्याशङ्क्याह—

अदृष्टानियमात् ॥ ५० ॥

उपाधिपरंपराहेतुभूतस्यादृष्टस्यापि ब्रह्मस्वरूपाश्रयत्वेन नियमहेत्वभावादव्यवस्थैव, उपाधिभिरदृष्टैश्च स्वसंबन्धेन ब्रह्मस्वरूपच्छेदासंभवात् ॥ ५० ॥

अभिसंध्यादिष्वपि चैवम् ॥ ५१ ॥

अदृष्टहेतुभूताभिसंध्यादिष्वप्युक्तादेव हेतोरनियम एव ॥ ५१ ॥

---

been expounded before that the screening of light in the case of one having light alone as the nature, is nothing but the destruction of light.

Or, the reading is—Abhāsā eva. In that case, (the meaning is) — the logical reasonings are fallacious. On account of (the word) Ca, is referred to also the contradiction with the Śrutis—

'Having regarded the Ātman as separate and impeller' (Śve 1·6)

'The Knower and the non-Knower, the two, Controller and non-Controller' (Śve. 1·9)

'Of the two, one eats the sweet fruit of the Pippala' (Mu. 3·1·1; Śve. 4·6)

etc., In the case of the difference in the limiting adjuncts imagined by Avidyā, the commingling of the enjoyment continues in the same form, on account of the admission of there being only one thing with its nature screened by all limiting adjuncts. ‖ 49 ‖

[358] Even in the doctrine advocating Jīva as Brahman screened by real limiting adjuncts, there would be a (proper) regulated adjustment, by virtue of the beginningless Unseen, the cause of the difference of limiting adjuncts — Raising this doubt, (the Sūtrakāra) says —

On account of the non-regulation by the Unseen. ‖ 50 ‖

In the case of the Unseen also, which is the cause of the series of limiting adjuncts, there being the absence of any cause for regulation owing to the nature of Brahman being its resort, the absence of any regulated arrangement does persist, because it is impossible that the nature of Brahman could be cut off by the limiting adjuncts and Unseens, by their own connection ‖ 50 ‖

And even in the case of meditation etc., this same ‖ 51 ‖

Even in the case of meditation etc., which are the cause of the Unseen there is the non-regulation, owing to the cause already mentioned. ‖ 51 ‖

प्रदेशभेदादिति चेन्नान्तर्भावात् ॥ ५२ ॥

[359] यद्यप्येकमेव ब्रह्मस्वरूपं तच्छेदानर्हं नानाविधोपाधिभिः संबध्यते, तथाप्युपाधिसंबन्धिब्रह्मप्रदेशभेदादुपपद्यत एव भोगव्यवस्थेति चेत् — तन्न। उपाधीनां तत्र तत्र गमनात्सर्वप्रदेशानां सर्वोपाध्यन्तर्भावाद्व्यतिकरस्तदवस्थ एव। प्रदेशभेदेन संबन्धेऽपि सर्वस्य ब्रह्मप्रदेशत्वात्तत्तत्प्रदेशसंबन्धि दुःखं ब्रह्मण एव स्यात्। पूर्वत्र

'नित्योपलब्ध्यनुपलब्धिप्रसङ्गोऽन्यतरनियमो वान्यथा' (ब्र. सू. २।३।३२)

'उपलब्धिवदनियमः' (ब्र. सू. २।३।३६)

इति द्वाभ्यां सूत्राभ्यां वेदबाह्यानां सर्वगतजीववादिनां दोष उक्तः। अत्र तु

'आभास एव च' (ब्र. सू. २।३।४९)

इत्यादिभिः सूत्रैर्वेदावलम्बिनामात्मैकत्ववादिनां दोष उच्यते ॥ ५२ ॥

अंशाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (७)

इति श्रीमद्भगवद्रामानुजाचार्यविरचिते
शारीरकमीमांसाभाष्ये द्वितीयाध्यायस्य
तृतीयः पादः ॥

If (it be said) on account of the difference of the occupied region.—No, on account of that being included. ॥ 52 ॥

[359] If (it be said) that although one and the same nature of Brahman, not deserving any cut by them (limiting adjuncts) is connected with the limiting adjuncts of various sorts, still, the regulated arrangement about enjoyment would duly be there, on account of the difference of the regions of Brahman connected with the limiting adjuncts—(our reply is) —That (is) not (so), because the limiting adjuncts would be going all over the place, and all the regions would come within the limiting adjuncts, the commingling would be there in the same condition. Although there is the association involving *difference of region, everything being the region occupied by Brahman, the* misery associated with the various regions would belong to Brahman alone. Earlier in the two Sūtras

'Otherwise, (there would be) the undesirable contingency—all-time perception and non-perception, or either as a rule'— (Bra. Sū. II. 3·32)

'No rule, like the perception' (Bra Sū. II. 3·36)

we spoke of the blemish as associated with the advocates of the Jīva being all-pervading, outside the pale of the Vedas. But here, in the Sūtras

'And (the Hetu is) only a fallacy' (Bra Sū. II. 3·49)

etc., is spoken of the blemish associated with the advocates of Ātman being one, hanging on to the Vedas. ॥ 52 ॥

Here ends the Aṁśādhikarana (7)

Here ends the Third Quarter of the Second Chapter in the Commentary on the Śārīraka-Mīmāmsā, composed by the Revered Preceptor Rāmānuja.

द्वितीयाध्याये चतुर्थः पादः।

तथा प्राणाः ॥ १ ॥ (अधिकरण १, सूत्राणि १–३)

[360] ब्रह्मव्यतिरिक्तस्य वियदादेः कृत्स्नस्य कार्यत्वेनोत्पत्तावुक्तायां जीवस्य कार्यत्वेऽपि स्वरूपान्यथाभावलक्षणोत्पत्तिरपोदिता। तत्प्रसङ्गेन जीवस्वरूपं विशोधितम्। संप्रति जीवोपकरणानामिन्द्रियाणां प्राणस्य चोत्पत्त्यादिप्रकारो विशोध्यते—

तत्र किमिन्द्रियाणां कार्यत्वं जीववद्, उत वियदादिवद्? इति चिन्त्यते—किं युक्तम्? जीववदेवेत्याह पूर्वपक्षी, तथा प्राणाः, इति। प्राणाः—इन्द्रियाणि। यथा जीवो नोत्पद्यते तथेन्द्रियाण्यपि नोत्पद्यन्ते। कुतः? श्रुतेः। यथा जीवस्यानुत्पत्तिः श्रुतेरवगम्यते तथा प्राणानामप्यनुत्पत्तिः श्रुतेरेवावगम्यते। तथा प्राणाः, इति प्रमाणमप्यतिदिश्यते। का पुनरत्र श्रुतिः?

'असद्वा इदमग्र आसीत्। तदाहुः किं तदासीदिति। ऋषयो वाव तेऽग्रे सदासीत्। तदाहुः के ते ऋषय इति। प्राणा वाव ऋषयः' (शत. ब्रा. ६।१।१)

इति जगदुत्पत्तेः प्रागिन्द्रियाणां सद्भावः श्रूयते। प्राणशब्दे बहुवचनादिन्द्रियाण्येवेति निश्चीयते। न चेयं श्रुतिः

Fourth Quarter of the Second Chapter

In the same way, the Prāṇas ॥ 1 ॥
(Adhikaraṇa 1, Sūtras 1–3)

[360] While speaking of the origination of the entire (world)—Sky etc., other than Brahman, owing to its being a product, in the case of the Jīva, origination characterised by the nature being otherwise, was denied even though Jīva is a product. The nature of Jīva also was clarified in dealing with this (question). Now, the manner of origination etc., of the sense-organs, the instruments (for enjoyment) of Jīva, and of Prāṇa is held under scrutiny (lit. being clarified).

There it is considered—Are the sense-organs an effect like the Jīva or like Sky etc.? What (is) proper? The disputant holding the prima-facie view says—Like the Jīva himself; (on account of the Sūtra) In the same way, the Prāṇas—Prāṇāḥ—sense-organs. As the Jīva is not produced, similarly *the sense-organs also are not produced.—Whence? On account of the Śruti—* Just as the non-origination of the Jīva is apprehended from the Śruti, so, the non-origination of the Prāṇas is apprehended from the Śruti itself. The proof (in that connection) also is (here) extended by—In the same way, the Prāṇas. What again is the Śruti here?—

'Asat, verily, was this in the beginning. There they ask—Whas was it at that time?—The seers, verily, they—in the beginning there was the Sat; they ask—Who (were) those seers? The Prāṇas, verily, the seers'. (Śa. Brā. 6·1·1)

—thus prior to the origination of the world, the existence of the sense-organs is mentioned in the Śruti. On account of the plural number of the word Prāṇs, it is ascertained that the sense-organs themselves (are meant here). Nor again, can this Śruti passage, like

'वायुश्चान्तरिक्षं चैतदमृतम्'　　　　　　　　　　　　　(बृ २।३।३)
'सैषानस्तमिता देवता यद्वायुः'　　　　　　　　　　　　(बृ १।५।२२)

इतिवच्चिरकालावस्थायित्वेन परिणेतुं शक्या,

'असद्वा इदमग्र आसीत्'　　　　　　　　　　　　　(शत ब्रा ६।१।१)

इति कृत्स्नप्रपञ्चप्रलयवेलायामप्यवस्थितत्वश्रवणात्। उत्पत्तिवादिन्यस्तु जीवोत्पत्तिवादिन्य इव नेतव्याः, इत्येवं प्राप्ते, अभिधीयते—वियदादिवदेव प्राणाश्चोत्पद्यन्ते। कुतः?

'सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीत्'　　　　　　　　　　　　(छा ६।२।१)
'आत्मा वा इदमेक एवाग्र आसीत्'　　　　　　　　　(ऐ. १।१)

इत्यादिषु प्राक्सृष्टेरेकत्वावधारणात्,

'एतस्माज्जायते प्राणो मनः सर्वेन्द्रियाणि च'　　　　　　(मु २।१।३)

इति, इन्द्रियाणामुत्पत्तिश्रवणाच्च प्रागवस्थानासंभवात्। न चात्मोत्पत्तिवादवदिन्द्रियोत्पत्तिवादाः परिणेतुं शक्याः, आत्मवदुत्पत्तिप्रतिषेधश्रुतीनां नित्यत्वबोधकश्रुतीनां चादर्शनात्।

'*The wind and the mid region—this immortal*'　(Br 2·3·3)
'*That this is the deity that never goes to set, viz the wind*'　(Br. 1·5 22)

be construed as referring to staying for a long time, on account of the Sruti passage

'*Asat verily, was this in the beginning*'　(Śa. Brā 6 1 1)

mentioning their stay even at the time of the dissolution of the entire worldly existence As for the (Sruti passages) advocating the origination (of Prānas), they should be construed like those (Srutis) advocating the origination of Jiva—This (prima-facie view) being reached, this is stated (in reply)—Like the Sky etc, themselves, the Prānas also are originated, Whence? On account of the ascertainment of everything being one prior to creation in (passages)

'*Existent (Sat) alone, gentle one, was this at the beginning*'　(Cha 6 2 1)
'*The Ātman verily, this one alone, was in the beginning*'　(Ai 1·1)

etc, and on account of the mention in the Sruti

'*From this, is originated Prāna, mind, and all sense-organs*'　(Mu 2 1 3)

of the origination of the sense-organs they could not be staying prior (to origination) Nor again is it possible to construe the passages under discussion about the origination of sense-organs like the passages dealing with the origination of the Ātman because as in the case of the Ātman there are not seen Sruti passages repudiating the origination and Sruti passages teaching about the eternal nature

'असद्वा इदमग्र आसीत्' (शत. ब्रा. ६।१।१)
इत्यादिवाक्येऽपि प्राणशब्देन परमात्मैव निर्दिश्यते,
'सर्वाणि ह वा इमानि भूतानि प्राणमेवाभिसंविशन्ति प्राणमभ्युज्जिहते'
(छा. १।११।५)
इति प्राणशब्दस्य परमात्मन्यपि प्रसिद्धेः ।
'प्राणा वाव ऋषयः' (शत. ब्रा. ६।१।१)
इत्यृषिशब्दश्च सर्वज्ञे तस्मिन्नेव युज्यते, न त्वचेतनेष्विन्द्रियेषु ॥ १ ॥

[361] ऋषयः प्राणाः, इति बहुवचनश्रुतिः कथमुपपद्यते ? इति चेत्, तत्राह —

गौण्यसंभवात्तत्प्राक्छ्रुतेश्च ॥ २ ॥

बहुवचनश्रुतिर्गौणी बह्वर्थासंभवात्तस्यैव परमात्मनः सृष्टेः प्रागवस्थानश्रुतेरेव ॥ २ ॥

तत्पूर्वकत्वाद्वाचः ॥ ३ ॥

इतश्च प्राणशब्दः परमात्मवचनः, वाचः परमात्मव्यतिरिक्तविषयस्य नामधेयस्य वाग्विषयभूतस्य वियदादिसृष्टिपूर्वकत्वात् ।
'तद्धेदं तर्ह्यव्याकृतमासीत् । तन्नामरूपाभ्यां व्याक्रियत' (बृ. १।४।७)

Even in the passage

'Asat, verily, was this in the beginning' (Śata. Brā. 6·1·1)

it is the Paramātman himself that is pointed out by the word Prāṇa, because the word Prāṇa is well-known in the sense of the Paramātman also as in

'All these beings, indeed, verily, enter into Prāṇa alone, leave off Prāṇa'. (Chā. 1·11·5)

The word Ṛṣi in (the passage)

'Prāṇas, verily, the seers (Ṛṣayaḥ)' (Śata. Brā. 6·1·1)

is used referring to the same Omniscient (Paramātman), not again referring to the non-sentient sense-organs. ‖ 1 ‖

[361] If (it be asked)—How is the Śruti (passage)—The Ṛṣis (are) the Prāṇas — using the plural number, appropriate ? — there (the Sūtrakāra) says—

Metaphorical, on account of the impossibility; and (Paramātman) being mentioned in the Śruti as being prior to that (creation) ‖ 2 ‖

The Śruti-passage containing the plural number is (to be understood as) metaphorical, on account of the impossibility of the sense—Many,—on account of that very Paramātman being mentioned in the Śruti itself, as staying prior to creation. ‖ 2 ‖

On account of Vāk being prior to that. ‖ 3 ‖

For this reason also, the word Prāṇa denotes Paramātman, on account of Vāk, the name referring to entities other than Paramātman, which is the province of speech, being there prior to the creation of Sky etc. That is to say—on account of the absence of entities resorting to name and form, according to (the passage)

'Then this indeed was unmodified. That became modified in name and form' (Bṛ. 1·4·7)

इति नामरूपभाजामभावात्तदानीं वागादीन्द्रियकार्याभावाच्च तानि न सन्तीत्यर्थः ॥ ३ ॥

प्राणोत्पत्त्यधिकरणं समाप्तम् (१)

सप्त गतेर्विशेषितत्वाच्च ॥ ४ ॥

(अधिकरण २, सू. ४–५)

[362] तानीन्द्रियाणि किं सप्तैव स्युरथ चैकादश ? इति चिन्त्यते—श्रुतिविप्रतिपत्तेः संशयः । किं प्राप्तम् ? सप्त, इति । कुतः ? गतेर्विशेषितत्वाच्च । गतिस्तावज्जायमानेन म्रियमाणेन च जीवेन सह लोकेषु संचरणरूपा सप्तानामेव श्रूयते,

'सप्त इमे लोका येषु चरन्ति प्राणा गुहाशया विहिता सप्त सप्त ।'

(मु. २।१।८)

इति । वीप्सा पुरुषभेदाभिप्राया । विशेषिताश्च ते गतिमन्तः प्राणाः स्वरूपतः

'यदा पञ्चावतिष्ठन्ते ज्ञानानि मनसा सह ।
बुद्धिश्च न विचेष्टेत तामाहुः परमां गतिम् ॥' (का ६।१०)

इति । शरीरान्तःसञ्चरणं विहाय मोक्षार्थगमनं परमा गतिः । एवं जीवेन सह जन्ममरणयोः सप्तानामेव गतिश्रवणाद्योगदशायां ज्ञानानीति विशेषितत्वाच्च, जीवस्य करणानि श्रोत्रत्वक्चक्षुर्जिह्वाघ्राणबुद्धिमनांसि सप्तैवेति गम्यते । यानि त्वितराणि विषयाणां ग्राहकत्वेन

---

and on account of the absence of the functioning of the sense-organs Vāk (speech) etc.—they do not exist ‖ 3 ‖

Here ends the Prānotpattyadhikarana (1)

Seven, on account of the movement and being particularised ‖ 4 ‖

(Adhikarana 2, Sūtras 4–5)

[362] It is now considered—Are those sense-organs only seven, or eleven ? The doubt (arises) on account of the contradiction in the Srutis—What (is the prima-facie view) reached ? Seven—Whence ? On account of the movement and being particularised As for the movement it is mentioned in the Sruti of the seven only, of the nature of moving about in the worlds, along with the Jiva being born and dying in

'These seven worlds, where Prānas placed in the caves, seven each, move about' (Mu 2 1·8)

—The repetition (of Sapta) refers to the different individuals And those Prānas moving about are particularised in their nature—as in

'When the five cognitions are steadied on, along with the mind, and Buddhi does not function,—they call that the final course' (Ka 6 10)

Paramā gatih (the final course) is the moving out for the sake of Moksa, abandoning the moving about within the body Thus because the Sruti describes the movement of the seven alone, along with the Jiva in birth and in death, and they are particularised as cognitions in the state of Yoga —it is known that the instruments (at the disposal) of Jiva, are seven alone—viz ear, skin, eye, tongue, nose Buddhi and mind As to the other sense-organs that are apprehended as extending upto fourteen on account of their being cognisors of the objects of senses, in (the passage)

'अष्टौ ग्रहाः' (बृ. ३।२।१)
'सप्त वै शीर्षण्याः प्राणा द्वाववाञ्चौ' (तै. सं. ५।१।७।१)

इत्यादिषु चतुर्दशपर्यन्तानि प्राणप्रतिपादकवाक्येषु वाक्पाणिपादपायूपस्थाहंकारचित्ताख्यानीन्द्रियाणि प्रतीयन्ते, तेषां जीवेन सह गतिश्रवणाभावाज्जीवस्याल्पोपकारकत्वमात्रेणौपचारिकः प्राणव्यपदेशः, इति ॥ ४ ॥

[363] एवं प्राप्ते, प्रचक्ष्महे--

हस्तादयस्तु स्थितेऽतो नैवम् ॥ ५ ॥

न सप्तैवेन्द्रियाणि, अपि त्वेकादश, हस्तादीनामपि शरीरे स्थिते जीवे तस्य भोगोपकरणत्वात्कार्यभेदाच्च। दृश्यते हि श्रोत्रादीनामिव हस्तादीनामपि कार्यभेद आदानादिः। अतस्तेऽपि सन्त्येव। अतो नैवम्—अतो हस्तादयो न सन्तीत्येव न मन्तव्यमित्यर्थः। अध्यवसायाभिमानचिन्तावृत्तिभेदान्मन एव बुद्ध्यहंकारचित्तशब्दैर्व्यपदिश्यते, इत्येकादशेन्द्रियाणि। अतः,

'दशेमे पुरुषे प्राणा आत्मैकादशः' (बृ. ३।९।४)

इत्यात्मशब्देन मनोऽभिधीयते।

'*Eight graspers*'. (Br. 3·2·1)
'*Seven, verily, are the Prāṇas in the head, two down below*' (Tai. Sam. 5·1·7·1)

etc., and designated as tongue, hand, foot, organ of evacuation, organ of generation, Ahaṁkāra, and mind in passages dealing with Prāṇa,—their reference as Prāṇa is metaphorical, owing to their obliging the Jīva in a slight manner, there being the absence in the Śruti of any movement. ॥ 4 ॥

[363] This (prima-facie view) being reached, we say (in reply)—

But hand etc., when (the Jīva is) abiding (in the body); therefore not thus. ॥ 5 ॥

The sense-organs are not only seven, but indeed eleven; because hands etc., also are the means of his enjoyment, when the Jīva abides in the body and there is also the difference in their functions. For, as in the case of ear etc , even in the case of hand etc., is seen different functioning, like taking etc. Therefore, they also do exist. *Ato naivam* — therefore, not thus; *therefore, it should not be thought that hand etc., do not exist*—this (is) the sense. The mind itself is referred to by the words—Buddhi, Ahaṁkāra and Citta, on account of the difference in functioning viz. resolution, egoism, and thought.—and so (there are) eleven sense-organs, Therefore in (the passage).

'*These ten Prāṇas in the Puruṣa, Ātman the eleventh*' (Br. 3·9·4)

the mind is denoted by the word Ātman. The number of the sense-organs stands (like that), established in the Sruti and the Smṛti—

'इन्द्रियाणि दशैकं च पञ्च चेन्द्रियगोचरा.' (गीता १३।५)
'तैजसानीन्द्रियाण्याहुर्देवा वैकारिका दश । एकादश मनश्चात्र' (वि पु १।२।४५-४६)

इत्यादिश्रुतिस्मृतिसिद्धेन्द्रियसंख्या स्थिता। अधिकसंख्यावादा मनोवृत्तिभेदाभिप्रायाः। न्यून व्यपदेशास्तु तत्र तत्र विवक्षितगमनादिकार्यविशेषप्रयुक्ताः ॥ ५ ॥

सप्तगत्यधिकरण समाप्तम् (२)

[364] अणवश्च ॥ ६ ॥

(अधिकरण ३, सू. ६—७)

'त एते सर्व एव समा सर्वेऽनन्ता' (बृ १।५।१३)

इत्यानन्त्यश्रवणाद्विभुत्वं प्राणानाम्, इति प्राप्ते, अभिधीयते—

'प्राणमनूत्क्रामन्त सर्वे प्राणा अनूत्क्रामन्ति' (बृ ४।४।२)

इत्युत्क्रान्त्यादिश्रवणात्परिमितत्वे सिद्धे सति, उत्क्रान्त्यादिषु पार्श्वस्थैरनुपलभ्यमानत्वादणवश्च प्राणाः। आनन्त्यश्रुतिस्तु

'अथ यो हैताननन्तानुपास्ते' (बृ १।५।१३)

इत्युपासनश्रवणादुपास्यप्राणविशेषभूतकार्यबाहुल्याभिप्राया ॥ ६ ॥

'*Sense-organs, ten and one, and five perceptible to the sense-organs*' (Gītā 13·5)

'*They speak of the sense-organs as constituted of light, the ten gods involving modification and the eleventh (is) the mind here*'. (V P 1·2 45-46)

—The views about some additional number take note of the different functions of the mind References to a smaller number are due to the special functions such as the movement etc, as desired in various passages ‖ 5 ‖

Here ends the Saptagatyadhikarana (2)

[364] And atomic ‖ 6 ‖

(Adhikarana 3, Sūtras 6-7)

'*All these all of them equal, all of them infinite*' (Br 1 5 13)

—In this passage the Prānas are spoken of as infinite and so they are all-pervading —This (prima-facie view) being reached—it is stated (by way of reply)

—When it is proved that the Prānas are limited in dimension on account of the mention of their departure etc, in the Sruti

'*All Prānas depart, following the departing Prāna*' (Br 4 4 2)

the Prānas are atomic as well on account of their not being perceived by those near by in departure etc As for the Sruti passage mentioning the infinite nature, that refers to the manifold functions of the particular Prāna which is to be worshipped as stated in

'*Now, verily, who worships these infinite*' (Br 1 5 13)

‖ 6 ‖

श्रेष्ठश्च ॥ ७ ॥

प्राणसंवादे शरीरस्थितिहेतुत्वेन श्रेष्ठतया निर्णीतो मुख्यप्राणः

'आनीदवातं स्वधया तदेकम्' (तै. ब्रा. २।८।९)

इति महाप्रलयसमये स्वकार्यभूतप्राणनसद्भावश्रवणात्

'एतस्माज्जायते' (मु. २।१।३)

इति जन्मश्रवणस्य जीवजन्मश्रवणवदुपपत्तेर्नोत्पद्यत इत्याशङ्क्य, प्राक्सृष्टेरेकत्वावधारणादि-विरोधात्

'एतस्माज्जायते प्राणः' (मु. २।१।३)

इति पृथिव्यादितुल्योत्पत्तिश्रवणादुत्पत्तिनिषेधाभावाच्च, जायत एव श्रेष्ठश्च प्राण इत्युच्यते।

'आनीदवातम्' (तै. ब्रा. २।८।९)

इति तु न जैवं श्रेष्ठं प्राणमभिप्रेत्योच्यते, अपि तु परस्य ब्रह्मण एकस्यैव विद्यमानत्वमुच्यते, अवातमिति तत्रैव श्रवणात्। पूर्वेणैव तुल्यन्यायत्वेऽपि पृथग्योगकरणमुत्तरचिन्तार्थम् ॥ ७ ॥

प्राणाणुत्वाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (३)

न वायुक्रिये पृथगुपदेशात् ॥ ८ ॥

(अधिकरण ४, सूत्राणि ८–११)

And the best ॥ 7 ॥

In the Prāna-dialogue the chief Prāna is judged as the best owing to his being the cause of the existence of the body, in

'That one breathed forth, without any wind by its own power'. (Tai. Brā. 2·8·9)

'From this, is originated' (Mu. 2·1·3)

where is mentioned the existence of life which is his effect, at the time of the dissolution,—the mention in the Śruti of the birth (of Prāna) being accounted for, like the mention in the Śruti of the birth of Jīva,—(the Prāṇa) is not originated—Raising this doubt, it is stated that the chief Prāna is also originated on account of (the prima-facie view) being in contradiction with the definite statement about there being only one, prior to creation, on account of the origination being like that of the earth etc.,

'From this, the Prāṇa is originated' (Mu. 2·1·3)

and on account of the absence of the repudiation of the origination. The expression

'It breathed forth, without the wind' (Tai. Brā. 2·8·9)

is not mentioned as referring to the chief Prāṇa belonging to the Jīva ; but (by that) is mentioned that the Highest Brahman alone was existing, on account of the expression in the Śruti—without the wind—even there. Though this is on a par with the previous (Sūtra) itself, its special distinct mention is for the consideration of later matter. ॥ 3 ॥

Here ends the Prāṇāṇutvādhikaraṇa (3)

Not the wind and (its) function, on account of separate mention. ॥ 8 ॥

(Adhikarana 4, Sūtras 8–11)

[365] सोऽयं श्रेष्ठः प्राणः, किं महाभूतद्वितीयवायुमात्रम्, तस्य वा स्पन्दनरूपक्रिया, अथ वायुरेव कंचन विशेषमापन्नः ? इति विषये वायुरेवेति प्राप्तम्,

'यः प्राणः स वायुः' (बृ. ३।१।५)

इति व्यपदेशात् । यद्वा वायुमात्रे प्राणत्वप्रसिद्ध्यभावात्, उच्छ्वासनिःश्वासादिवायुक्रियायां प्राणशब्दप्रसिद्धेश्च तत्क्रियैवेति प्राप्ते, न वायुमात्रं न च तत्क्रियेत्युच्यते । कुतः ? पृथगुपदेशात्,

'एतस्माज्जायते प्राणो मनः सर्वेन्द्रियाणि च ।
खं वायुः' (मु. २।१।३)

इति । तत एव पृथगुपदेशाद्वायुक्रियापि न भवति प्राणः । न हि तेजःप्रभृतीनां क्रिया तैः सह पृथग्द्रव्यतयोपदिश्यते—

'यः प्राणः स वायुः' (बृ ३।१।५)

इति तु वायुरेवावस्थान्तरमापन्नः प्राणो न तेजःप्रभृतिवत्तत्त्वान्तरमिति ज्ञापनार्थम् । उच्छ्वासनिःश्वासादावपि, प्राणः स्पन्दते, इति क्रियावति द्रव्य एव प्राणशब्दप्रसिद्धिर्न क्रियामात्रे ॥ ८ ॥

[366] किमयं प्राणो वायोर्विकारः सन्नग्निवद्भूतान्तरम् ? नेत्याह—

चक्षुरादिवत्तु तत्सहशिष्ट्यादिभ्यः ॥ ९ ॥

---

[365] Is this, the chief Prāna merely the wind, the second great element; or its throbbing action, or Vāyu himself attaining to some speciality? —this being the doubt, (the Pūrvapakṣa view) is reached—Vāyu himself, on account of the reference—

'*What the Prāṇa (is), that (is) Vāyu*' (Br. 3·1·5)

or, on account of the absence of Prāna being known merely to refer to the wind, and the word Prāna being well-known in (the sense of) the functions of the wind, such as breathing out and breathing in, its function itself — This (prima-facie view) being reached, it is stated — It is not mere wind, nor its functioning. Whence? On account of the separate mention in

'*From this is originated Prāṇa, mind and all sense-organs, Sky, Vāyu*'. (Mu. 2·1·3)

For that very reason, separate mention—the function of Vāyu also can not be Prāṇa. Not indeed the function of light etc., is stated as a separate thing along with them. (The passage)

'*What (is) Prāṇa, that (is) Vāyu*'. (Br. 3·1·5)

is for the sake of making one know that Vāyu himself attaining to a different state is the Prāṇa and not a separate entity like light etc. Because Prāṇa alone functions in breathing out and breathing in; the word Prāna is well-known as referring to a substance possessed of a function and not the functioning alone. ॥ 8 ॥

[366] Is this Prāna being a modification of Vāyu, another element like Agni? — No — says (the Sūtrakāra) —

Like the eye etc., on account of its particularised mention etc., along with them etc. ॥ 9 ॥

नायं भूतविशेषः, अपि तु चक्षुरादिवज्जीवोपकरणविशेषः। तच्चोपकरणत्वमुपकरणभूतैरिन्द्रियैः सहशिष्टयादिभ्योऽवगम्यते। चक्षुरादिभिः सहायं प्राणः शिष्यते प्राणसंवादादिषु। तत्सजातीयत्वे हि तैः सह शासनं युज्यते। प्राणशब्दपरिगृहीतेषु करणेष्वस्य विशिष्याभिधानमादिशब्देन गृह्यते,

'अथ ह य एवायं मुख्यप्राणः' (छा. १।२।७)

'योऽयं मध्यमप्राणः' (बृ. १।५।२१)

इत्यादिषु विशिष्याभिधानात् ॥ ९ ॥

[367] चक्षुरादिवदस्यापि करणत्वे तद्वदस्यापि जीवं प्रत्युपकारविशेषरूपक्रियया भवितव्यम्। सा तु न दृश्यते। अतो नायं चक्षुरादिवद्भवितुमर्हतीति चेत्, तत्राह--

अकरणत्वाच्च न दोषस्तथा हि दर्शयति ॥ १० ॥

अकरणत्वात्- करणं क्रिया, अक्रियत्वात्- अस्य प्राणस्य जीवं प्रत्युपकारविशेषरूपक्रियारहितत्वाच्च यो दोष उद्भाव्यते स नास्ति। यत उपकारविशेषरूपशरीरेन्द्रियधारणादिरूपां क्रियां दर्शयति श्रुतिः —

'यस्मिन्नुत्क्रान्त इदं शरीरं पापिष्ठतरमिव दृश्यते स एव श्रेष्ठः' (छा. ५।१।७)

This (Prāna) is not a distinct element, but it is a special helping instrument of the Jīva, like the eye etc , and the nature of the instrument is known from its being mentioned along with the sense-organs that are the instruments. This Prāṇa is mentioned along with the eye etc , in the Prāna-dialogue etc. Its mention along with them is proper, because it is homogeneous with them. By the word Ādi is understood its special denotation among the instruments, referred to by the word Prāna on account of its special denotation in

'Now, verily, who, indeed, this chief Prāṇa' (Chā. 1·2·7)

'Who this, the middle Prāṇa' (Br. 1-5 21)

etc. ‖ 9 ‖

[367] If this one also were an instrument like the eye etc., then like them this one also must be possessed of a special functioning viz. obliging the Jīva. But that is not seen. Therefore, this one does not deserve to be like the eye etc. — If (it is argued) thus, there (the Sūtrakāra) says —

And no blemish on account of non-functioning, for the Śruti shows (that) to that effect. ‖ 10 ‖

Akaraṇatvāt — , Karaṇa—functioning; on account of not functioning. That blemish which is pointed out, on account of this Prāna being without any special function that obliges the Jīva, — that does not exist, because the Sruti shows to that effect the functioning in the form of supporting the body, sense-organs etc., tantamount to a special obligation, in

'That alone is the most eminent on whose departure the body is seen as though the most wretched'. (Chā. 5·1·7)

इत्युक्त्वा, वागाद्युत्क्रमणेऽपि शरीरस्येन्द्रियान्तराणां च स्थितिं दर्शयित्वा, प्राणोत्क्रमणे शरीरेन्द्रियशैथिल्याभिधानात्। अतः प्राणापानव्यानोदानसमानाकारेण पञ्चधावस्थितोऽयं प्राणः शरीरेन्द्रियधारणादिना जीवस्योपकरोतीति चक्षुरादिवत्करणत्वम् ॥ १० ॥

[368] नन्वेवं नामभेदात्कार्यभेदाच्च प्राणापानादयस्तत्त्वान्तराणि स्युः, तत्राह—

पञ्चवृत्तिर्मनोवद्व्यपदिश्यते ॥ ११ ॥

यथा कामादिवृत्तिभेदे तत्कार्यभेदेऽपि न कामादिकं मनसस्तत्त्वान्तरम्

'कामः संकल्पो विचिकित्सा श्रद्धाश्रद्धा धृतिरधृतिर्ह्रीर्धीर्भीरित्येतत्सर्वं मन एव' (बृ. १।५।३)

इति वचनात्, एवं

'प्राणोऽपानो व्यान उदानः समान इत्येतत्सर्वं प्राण एव' (बृ. १।५।३)

इति वचनादपानादयोऽपि प्राणस्यैव वृत्तिविशेषाः, न तत्त्वान्तरमित्यवगम्यते ॥ ११ ॥

वायुक्रियाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (४)

अणुश्च ॥ १२ ॥

(अधिकरण ५, सू. १२)

— because, having mentioned this and having shown the body and the other sense-organs as existing even when the Vāk and others had departed, there is the mention of the body and the sense-organs as ceasing to function. Therefore, this Prāna staying five-fold (in the form) Prāna, Apāna, Vyāna, Udāna and Samāna, does oblige the Jīva by supporting the body and the sense-organs -and so, Prāna has the nature of an instrument, like eye etc. ॥ 10 ॥

[368] I say (says the objector) — on account of the difference in nāme and the difference in functioning in this way, Prāna, Apāna etc., would be separate entities — there (the Sūtrakāra) says —

(Prāṇa) is mentioned as having five functions, like the mind ॥ 11 ॥

Just as even though there is the difference of their functions, when there is the difference of the natures, desire etc., desire etc., are not different entities from the mind, on account of the statement in (the passage)

'Desire, thought, doubt, faith, want of faith, firmness, want of firmness, bashfulness, intellect, fear,—all this (is) mind alone'. (Br. 1·5·3)

—similarly, it is known from the statement

'Thus, Prāṇa, Apāna, Vyāna, Udāna, Samāna—all this (is) Prāṇa alone' (Br. 1·5·3)

that even Apāna and others are special functionings of Prāṇa alone, and not separate entities. ॥ 11 ॥

Here ends the Vāyukriyādhikarana (4)

And atomic ॥ 12 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 5, Sūtra 12)

[369] अणुश्चायम्, पूर्ववदुत्क्रान्त्यादिश्रवणात्,

'तमुत्क्रामन्तं प्राणोऽनूत्क्रामति' (बृ. ४,४।२)

इत्यादिषु। आधिकाशङ्का तु

'सम एभिस्त्रिभिर्लोकैः समोऽनेन सर्वेण' (बृ. १।३।२२)

'प्राणे सर्वं प्रतिष्ठितम्' (प्र. २।६)

'सर्वं हीदं प्राणेनावृतम्' (ऐ. १।६।३)

इत्यादिश्रवणान्महापरिमाण इति। परिहारस्तूत्क्रान्त्यादिश्रवणात्परिच्छिन्नत्वे निश्चिते, सर्वस्य प्राणिजातस्य प्राणायत्तस्थितित्वेन वैभववादोपपत्तिरिति ॥ १२ ॥

श्रेष्ठाणुत्वाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (५)

ज्योतिराद्यधिष्ठानं तु तदामननात्प्राणवता शब्दात् ॥ १३ ॥

(अधिकरण ६, सू. १३–१४)

[370] सश्रेष्ठानां प्राणानां ब्रह्मण उत्पत्तिरियत्तापरिमाणं चोक्तम्। तेषां प्राणानामग्न्यादिदेवताधिष्ठितत्वं च पूर्वमेव

'अभिमानिव्यपदेशस्तु विशेषानुगतिभ्याम्' (ब्र. सू. २।१।५)

इत्यनेन सूत्रेण प्रसङ्गादुपपादितम्। जीवस्य च स्वभोगसाधनानामेषामधिष्ठातृत्वं लोकसिद्धम्,

---

[369] This one again is atomic, on account of the statement in the Śruti about departure etc., as before in

'The Prāṇa departs following him departing' (Br 4·4·2)

etc. A further doubt arises on account of the statement in the Śruti passages

'(This one is) equal to these three worlds; (this one is) equal to all this' (Br. 1·3·22)

'Everything is established in Prāṇa' (Pra. 2·6)

'All this is indeed enveloped by Prāṇa' (Ai. I 6·3)

etc.,—that he is all-pervading (*Mahāparimāna*)—And the removal (of that doubt is)—When the limited dimension is definitely ascertained by the statement in the Śruti about departure, etc., owing to the sustenance of the entire aggregate of beings being dependent upon Prāṇa, the glorifying encomium (on Prāṇa) stands to reason. ॥ 12 ॥

Here ends the Śreṣṭhāṇutvādhikaraṇa (5)

But supervision by Fire etc., on account of His thought, along with the one possessed of Prāṇa (Jiva), from the Word. ॥ 13 ॥

(Adhikarana 6, Sūtras 13–14)

[370] It is stated that the Prāṇas along with the Chief (Prāṇa) are originated from Brahman and that they have a limited dimension, and those Prāṇas being supervised over by the deities Agni etc., has been propounded in passing, already in the Sūtra —

'But the reference to the supervising (deity) on account of the particular distinction and the following after'. (Bra. Sū. II. 1·5)

And that Jiva supervises over these means for his enjoyment, is well-known among the people; and it is established by the Sruti as well in (the passage)—

'एवमेवैष एतान्प्राणान्गृहीत्वा स्वे शरीरे यथाकाम परिवर्तते' (बृ २।१।१८)

इत्यादिश्रुतिसिद्धं च। तदिदं जीवस्याग्न्यादिदेवतानां च प्राणविषयमधिष्ठानं किं स्वायत्तम्, उत परायत्तम्? इति विषये, नैरपेक्ष्यात्स्वायत्तमिति प्राप्ते, उच्यते — ज्योतिराद्यधिष्ठानम्, इति। प्राणवता जीवेन सह ज्योतिरादीनामग्न्यादिदेवतानां प्राणविषयमधिष्ठानम्, तदामननात्- तस्य परमात्मन आमननात्, भवति। आमननम्—आभिमुख्येन मननं—परमात्मनः संकल्पादेव भवतीत्यर्थः। कुत एतत्? शब्दात्। इन्द्रियाणां साभिमानिदेवतानां जीवात्मनश्च स्वकार्येषु परमपुरुषमननायत्तत्वशास्त्रात्। यथा, अन्तर्यामिब्राह्मणादिषु

'योऽग्नौ तिष्ठन्नग्नेरन्तरो यमग्निर्न वेद यस्याग्नि शरीर योऽग्निमन्तरो यमयति स त आत्मान्तर्याम्यमृत।' (बृ ३।७।५)

'यो वायौ तिष्ठन्' (बृ ३।७।७)

'य आदित्ये तिष्ठन्' (बृ ३।७।९)

'य आत्मनि तिष्ठन्' (बृ ३।७।२२)

'यश्चक्षुषि तिष्ठन्' (बृ ३।७।१८)

इत्यादि। यथा च

'भीषास्माद्वातः पवते। भीषोदेति सूर्यः। भीषास्मादग्निश्चेन्द्रश्च। मृत्युर्धावति पञ्चम' (तै २।८)

'Thus indeed, this one, having taken hold of these Prānas, moves around at will in his body' (Br 2 1·18)

etc, So, this supervision in respect of Prāna by Jiva and the deities, Agni etc,— Is it self-dependent, or dependent upon others?— this doubt being there, the (prima-facie view) being reached —It is self-dependent owing to its not standing in need of anything —It is stated (in reply) — Supervision by Fire etc Prānavatā — along with the Jiva, supervision in respect of Prāna, — Jyotirādinām — of deities Agni etc, Tadāmananāt — from the thought alone of the Paramātman Āmananam — reflecting whole-heartedly that is to say, it occurs from the reflection of the Paramātman itself Whence this? Sabdāt— from the Sāstra propounding the dependence upon the reflection of the highest Purusa in respect of their functionings of the sense-organs with their supervising deities and of the Jivātman—as in the *Brāhmana* section dealing with the inner Controller —

'Who, abiding in Agni, within Agni, whom Agni knows not, whose body Agni is, who controls Agni, within, — he, that your Ātman, the inner Controller, immortal' (Br 3 7 5)

'Who abiding in Vāyu (Br 3 7 7)

'Who abiding in Āditya' (Br 3·7 9)

'Who, abiding in the Ātman' (Br 3 7 22)

'Who abiding in the eye' (Br 3 7 18)

etc, and as in

'By fear from him, the wind blows on by fear rises up the Sun, by fear from him, Agni also, and Indra, Death runs on the fifth' (Tai 2 8)

इति। तथा

'एतस्य वाक्षरस्य प्रशासने गार्गि सूर्याचन्द्रमसौ विधृतौ तिष्ठतः'
(बृ. ३।८।९)

इत्यादि ॥ १३ ॥

तस्य च नित्यत्वात् ॥ १४ ॥

सर्वेषां परमात्माधिष्ठितत्वस्य नित्यत्वात्स्वरूपानुबन्धित्वेन नियतत्वाच्च, तत्संकल्पादेवैषामधिष्ठातृत्वमवर्जनीयम्।

'तत्सृष्ट्वा। तदेवानुप्राविशत्। तदनुप्रविश्य। सच्च त्यच्चाभवत्'
(तै. २।६)

इत्यादिना परमपुरुषस्य नियन्तृत्वेन सर्वचिदचिद्वस्त्वनुप्रवेशः स्वरूपानुबन्धी श्रूयते। स्मर्यते च—

'विष्टभ्याहमिदं कृत्स्नमेकांशेन स्थितो जगत्।' (गीता १०।४२)

इति ॥ १४ ॥

ज्योतिराद्यधिष्ठानाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (६)

त इन्द्रियाणि तद्व्यपदेशादन्यत्र श्रेष्ठात् ॥ १५ ॥

(अधिकरण ७, सू १५–१६)

—Similarly,

'*Under the orders of this Aksara indeed (O) Gārgī, the Sun and the Moon stay on, supported*' (Br. 3·8·9)

etc. ॥ 13 ॥

And that (supervision) being always ॥ 14 ॥

Because in the case of all, being supervised over by the Paramātman is always there, as also being regulated owing to the continuous connection with His own nature, these being supervised over by His thought alone is unavoidable. It is mentioned in the Śruti

'*Having created that, he entered into that itself; having entered into that, he became Sat and Tyat*' (Tai. 2·6)

etc, that, owing to the highest Puruṣa being the controller, his entrance into all sentient and non-sentient entities depends upon the continuous connection with his own nature. And it is mentioned in the Smṛti—

'*Having enveloped all this world by a portion (of mine) I stay on*'. (Gītā 10·42)

॥ 14 ॥

Here ends the Jyotirādyadhiṣṭhānādhikaraṇa (6)

They (are) the sense-organs, on account of that reference being made, in the case of (Prāṇas) other than the Chief. ॥ 15 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 7, Sūtras 15–16)

[371] किं सर्वे प्राणशब्दनिर्दिष्टा इन्द्रियाणि, उत श्रेष्ठप्राणव्यतिरिक्ता एव ? इति विषये, प्राणशब्दवाच्यत्वात्करणत्वाच्च सर्व एवेन्द्रियाणि, इति प्राप्ते, उच्यते—

श्रेष्ठव्यतिरिक्ता एव प्राणा इन्द्रियाणि। कुतः ? श्रेष्ठादन्येष्वेव प्राणेषु, तद्व्यपदेशात्-इन्द्रियव्यपदेशात्।

'इन्द्रियाणि दशैकं च पञ्च चेन्द्रियगोचराः।' (गीता १३।५)

इत्यादिभिर्हि चक्षुरादिषु समनस्केष्वेवेन्द्रियशब्दो व्यपदिश्यते ॥ १५ ॥

भेदश्रुतेर्वैलक्षण्याच्च ॥ १६ ॥

'एतस्माज्जायते प्राणो मनः सर्वेन्द्रियाणि च' (मु. २।१।३)

इत्यादिष्विन्द्रियेभ्यः प्राणस्य पृथक्छ्रवणात्प्राणव्यतिरिक्तानामेवेन्द्रियत्वमवगम्यते। मनसः पृथक्छ्रवणेऽपि तस्यान्यत्रेन्द्रियान्तर्भाव उक्तः

'मनःषष्ठानीन्द्रियाणि' (गीता १५।७)

इत्यादौ। वैलक्षण्यं चक्षुरादिभ्यः श्रेष्ठप्राणस्योपलभ्यते। सुषुप्तौ हि प्राणस्य वृत्तिरुपलभ्यते, चक्षुरादीनां तु वृत्तिर्नोपलभ्यते। कार्यं च चक्षुर्वागादीनां समनस्कानां ज्ञानकर्मसाधनत्वम्,

---

[371] Are all those designated by the word Prāna, sense-organs, or only those different from the chief Prāna ?—In the case of this doubt, this (prima-facie view) being reached, viz.—all without exception (are) the sense-organs, on account of their being denoted by the word Prāṇa, and on account of their being the instruments—it is stated (in reply)—

Prāṇas different from the Chief (Prāṇa) are alone the sense-organs. Whence ? Because Prānas different from the Chief alone are so referred to; are referred to as sense-organs; for, in

'Sense-organs, ten and one; and five perceptible to the sense-organs' (Gītā. 13·5)

etc., the word Indriya refers to the eye etc., along with the mind alone. ॥ 15 ॥

On account of the Śruti referring to the difference and on account of dissimilarity ॥ 16 ॥

On account of Prāna being mentioned in the Sruti separately from the sense-organs in

'From this is originated Prāna, mind and all sense-organs' (Mu. 2·1·3)

etc., it is known that only those different from the Prāna are the sense-organs. Although the mind is (here) mentioned separately in the Śruti, its inclusion among the sense-organs is mentioned elsewhere in

'The sense-organs, with the mind as the sixth' (Gītā 15·7)

etc. The dissimilarity of the chief Prāṇa from the eye, etc., is patent — for, in deep sleep, the functioning of the Prāṇa is evident; but the functioning of the eye etc, is not evident. The activity of eye, tongue, etc., along with the mind, is the means of knowledge and action; that of Prāṇa, however, of

प्राणस्य तु शरीरेन्द्रियधारणम्। प्राणाधीनधारणत्वादिन्द्रियेषु प्राणशब्दव्यपदेशः। तथा च श्रुतिः—

'त एतस्यैव सर्वे रूपमभवन्। तस्मादेत एतेनाख्यायन्ते' (बृ. १।५।२१)

इति। रूपमभवन्— शरीरमभवंस्तदधीनप्रवृत्तयोऽभवन्नित्यर्थः ॥ १६ ॥

इन्द्रियाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (७)

संज्ञामूर्तिकॢप्तिस्तु त्रिवृत्कुर्वत उपदेशात् ॥ १७ ॥

(अधिकरण ८, सूत्राणि १७–१९)

[372] भूतेन्द्रियादीनां समष्टिसृष्टिर्जीवानां कर्तृत्वं च परस्माद्ब्रह्मणः, इत्युक्तं पुरस्तात्। जीवानां स्वेन्द्रियाधिष्ठानं च परायत्तमिति चानन्तरं स्थिरीकरणाय स्मारितम्। या त्वियं नामरूपव्याकरणात्मिका प्रपञ्चव्यष्टिसृष्टिः, सा किं समष्टिजीवस्य हिरण्यगर्भस्यैव कर्म, उत तेजःप्रभृतिशरीरकस्य परस्यात्यादिसृष्टिवद्धिरण्यगर्भशरीरकस्य परस्य ब्रह्मणः? इतीदानीं चिन्त्यते—किं युक्तम्? समष्टिजीवस्येति। कुतः?

'अनेन जीवेनात्मनानुप्रविश्य नामरूपे व्याकरवाणि' (छा. ६।३।२)

इति जीवकर्तृत्वश्रवणात्। न हि परा देवता स्वेन रूपेण नामरूपे व्याकरवाणीत्यैक्षत, अपि तु

---

supporting the body and the sense-organs. The word Prāṇa is used to refer to the sense-organs on account of their sustenance being dependent upon Prāṇa. And to that effect is the Sruti —

'All became the form of this one alone. Therefore, they are known after this one' (Bṛ. 1·5·21)

Rūpamabhavan—became the body; had their activity dependent upon that — this (is) the sense ‖ 16 ‖

Here ends the Indriyādhikaraṇa (7)

But the modification in name and form, from (the Paramātman) making (the world) three-fold, on account of (such) teaching. ‖ 17 ‖

(Adhikaraṇa 8, Sūtras 17–19)

[372] The cosmic creation of elements, sense-organs etc., and the nature of Jīvas as agent — (come) from the Highest Brahman — this has been spoken of already. It was afterwards specially brought to the mind, to make this firm, that the supervision of the Jīvas of their sense-organs is dependent upon the Highest. As to this individual creation in the worldly creation involving modification in name and form — is that the work of Hiranyagarbha, the cosmic Jīva alone, or of the Highest Brahman having Hiraṇyagarbha as the body, like the creation of water etc., by the Highest having the light etc., as the body? — This is now being looked into — What (is) proper? Of the cosmic Jīva. Whence? On account of the mention in the Sruti (passage)

'Having entered into, by this Living Self, may I modify name and form' (Chā. 6·3·2)

of Jīva being the agent. Not indeed did the highest Devatā (Deity) reflect —May I modify name and form by my own nature, but by the form of Jīva who

स्वांशभूतेन जीवरूपेण, अनेन जीवेनात्मना— इति वचनात् ।

नन्वेवं चारेणानुप्रविश्य परबलं संकलयानीतिवत्, व्याकरवाणीत्युत्तमपुरुष· कर्तृस्थक्रियश्च प्रविशतिर्लाक्षणिकः स्यात्—

नैवम् । तत्र राजचारयोः स्वरूपभेदाल्लाक्षणिकत्वम्, इह तु जीवस्यापि स्वांशत्वेन स्वरूपत्वात्तेन रूपेण प्रवेशो व्याकरणं चात्मन एवेति न लाक्षणिकत्वप्रसङ्गः । न च सहयोगलक्षणेयं तृतीया, कारकविभक्तौ संभवन्त्यामुपपदविभक्तेरन्याय्यत्वात् । न च करणे तृतीया, ब्रह्मकर्तृकयो· प्रवेशव्याकरणयोर्जीवस्य साधकतमत्वाभावात् । न च जीवस्य कर्तृत्वं प्रवेशमात्रे पर्यवस्यति, नामरूपव्याकरणं तु ब्रह्मण एवेति शक्यं वक्तुम्, क्त्वाप्रत्ययेन समानकर्तृकत्वप्रतीते· । जीवस्य स्वांशत्वेन स्वरूपत्वेऽपि परस्वरूपव्यावृत्त्यर्थोऽनेन जीवेनेति पराक्त्वेन परामर्शः । अतो हिरण्यगर्भकर्तृकेयं नामरूपव्याक्रिया । अत एव स्मृतिषु चतुर्मुखकर्तृकं सृष्टिप्रकरणे नामरूपव्याकरणं संकीर्त्यते—

'नाम रूप च भूताना कृत्याना च प्रपञ्चनम् ।
वेदशब्देभ्य एवादौ देवादीना चकार स ॥' (वि पु. १५।६२)

इत्यादि ।

---

had become her portion, on account of the expression — By this Living Self.

I say (says some objector), — In this way, as in — Having entered within, by means of a spy, I shall take stock of the army of the enemy — the first person in Vyākaravāni, and the expression Praviśati which refers to the action in the agent, would be used metaphorically — (the reply is) —

Not so, there on account of the difference in nature of the king and the spy, there is the metaphorical use, but here, because the Jiva also is (Brahman's) own nature owing to his being its portion, entrance in that form and the modification belong indeed to himself,— so, no undesirable contingency of a metaphorical use Nor again, is (this use of) the instrumental (case) pointing out to association, as it is not fair to understand a case as qualifying something when the use of it as (causal) directly connected is possible Nor again, is the instrumental (case in the sense of) an instrument, on account of the Jiva being not the most efficient cause for entrance and modification which are the work of Brahman Nor is it possible to say that Jiva's work as agent ends with mere entrance, but the modification of name and form belongs to Brahman alone on account of the apprehension of a common agent owing to the gerund-termination Although Jiva is its (Brahman's) own nature by being its portion, the indirect reference in Jivena is for the exclusion of the nature of the Highest Therefore, the modification in name and form is caused by Hiranyagarbha—Therefore indeed, is declared in the Creation-section, modification in name and form as being effected by the four-faced (Brahmadeva), in the Smrti works —

'The name and form, and the detailed amplification of the actions in the case of creatures, gods and others, he effected from the words of the Veda alone in the beginning' (V P 1 5·62)

etc

[373] एवं प्राप्ते, अभिधीयते— संज्ञामूर्तिक्लृप्तिस्तु— इति। तुशब्दः पक्षं व्यावर्तयति। संज्ञामूर्तिक्लृप्तिः— नामरूपव्याकरणम्। तत्त्रिवृत्कुर्वतः परस्यैव ब्रह्मणः, तस्यैव नामरूपव्याकरणोपदेशात्। त्रिवृत्करणं कुर्वत एव हि नामरूपव्याकरणमुपदिश्यते—

'सेयं देवतैक्षत हन्ताहमिमास्तिस्रो देवता अनेन जीवेनात्मनानुप्रविश्य नामरूपे व्याकरवाणि तासां त्रिवृतं त्रिवृतमेकैकां करवाणि' (छा. ६।३।२–३)

इति समानकर्तृकत्वप्रतीतेः। त्रिवृत्करणं तु चतुर्मुखस्याण्डान्तर्वर्तिनो न संभवति, त्रिवृत्कृतैस्तेजोबन्नैर्ह्यण्डमुत्पाद्यते। चतुर्मुखस्य चाण्डे संभवः स्मर्यते —

'तस्मिन्नण्डेऽभवद् ब्रह्मा सर्वलोकपितामहः।' (मनु. १।९)

इति। अतः, त्रिवृत्करणं परस्यैव ब्रह्मणः। तत्समानकर्तृकं नामरूपव्याकरणं च तस्यैवेति विज्ञायते। कथं तर्हि

'अनेन जीवेन' (छा. ६।३।२)

इति संगच्छते? आत्मना जीवेन, इति सामानाधिकरण्यात्, जीवशरीरकं परं ब्रह्मैव जीवशब्देनाभिधीयते, यथा

'तत्तेज ऐक्षत...तदपोऽसृजत' (छा. ६।२।३)

'ता आप ऐक्षन्त...ता अन्नमसृजन्त' (छा. ६।२।४)

---

[373] This (prima-facie view) being reached, it is stated (in reply) — But the modification in name and form. The word Tu (but) turns away the view (expressed before). Saṁjñāmūrtikḷpti — the modification in name and form; that (comes) from the Highest Brahman alone, making (the world) three-fold; for, that itself is declared as the modification in name and form; for, modification in name and form is mentioned, of that alone effecting the process of three-fold modification on account of the apprehension of the same agent in

'That this Deity reflected—Goodness! I, having entered into these three deities by this Living Self would modify name and form; of those, I shall make each of them three-fold, three-fold' (Chā. 6·3·2–3)

But the threefold modification is not possible in the case of the Four-faced (Brahmadeva) residing within the Egg; for, the egg indeed is produced by water, food, light made three-fold. And the existence (in the Egg) of the Four-faced (Brahmadeva) is mentioned in the Smṛti —

'In that egg stayed Bramadeva, the grand-father of all peoples.' (Manu 1·9)

Thus, the three fold modification is by the Highest Brahman itself. And the modification in name and form having a common agent for that is known to be by that itself. How then does (the Śruti passage)

'By this Living' (Chā. 6·3·2)

harmonise? On account of the case-co-ordination in Ātmanā (by the Self), Jīvena (by the Jīva) — the Highest Brahman itself having Jīva as its body is denoted by the word Jīva, as in (the passages)

'That Tejas reflected ... that created Waters' (Chā. 6·2·3)

'Those Waters reflected ... those created Anna' (Chā. 6·2·4)

इति तेजःप्रभृतिशरीरकं परमेव ब्रह्माभिधीयते। अतो जीवसमष्टिभूतहिरण्यगर्भशरीरकस्य परस्यैव ब्रह्मणः कर्म नामरूपव्याकरणम्। एवं च

'प्रविश्य नामरूपे व्याकरवाणि' (छा ६।३।२)

इति प्रविशतिरुत्तमपुरुषश्चाक्लिष्टौ मुख्यार्थावेव भवतः। प्रवेशव्याकरणयोः समानकर्तृकत्वमप्युपपद्यते। चतुर्मुखशरीरकस्य परस्यैव ब्रह्मणः कर्म देवादिविचित्रसृष्टिरिति चतुर्मुखकर्तृकसृष्टिप्रकरणे नामरूपव्याक्रियोपदेशश्चोपपद्यते। अतः

'सेयं देवता' (छा. ६।३।२)

इत्यादिवाक्यस्यायमर्थः—इमास्तेजोबन्नरूपास्तिस्रो देवता अनेन जीवेन जीवसमष्टिविशिष्टेनात्मनानुप्रविश्य, नामरूपे व्याकरवाणि—देवादिविचित्रसृष्टिं तन्नामधेयानि च करवाणि, तदर्थमन्योन्यसंसर्गमप्राप्तानामेषां तेजोबन्नानां विशेषसृष्टयसमर्थानां तत्सामर्थ्यायैकैकां त्रिवृतं त्रिवृतं करवाणि, इति। अतः परस्यैव ब्रह्मणः कर्मेदं नामरूपव्याकरणम् ॥ १७ ॥

[374] अथ स्यात्—नामरूपव्याकरणस्य त्रिवृत्करणेनैककर्तृकत्वात्परमात्मकर्तृकत्वामिति न शक्यते वक्तुम्, त्रिवृत्करणस्यापि जीवकर्तृकत्वसंभवात्। अण्डसृष्ट्युत्तरकाले हि चतुर्मुखसृष्टजीवेषु त्रिवृत्करणप्रकार उपदिश्यते

---

the Highest Brahman itself having Light etc, as the body is denoted Hence the modification in name and form is the work of the Highest Brahman itself having for the body Hiranyagarbha, the cosmic Jiva And thus in

'Having entered, I would modify name and form' (Cha 6·3 2)

Pravisati and the first person can comfortably be taken in the primary sense itself And that entrance and modification have a common agent is also appropriate And because the variegated creation of gods etc, is the work of the Highest Brahman itself, with the Four-faced Brahmadeva as the body, the mention about name — form — modification in the Section dealing with the creation by the Four-faced Brahmadeva is accounted for Therefore, this is the meaning of the passage

'That this Deity' (Cha 6 3 2)

etc — These three deities having the forms of light, water, food, having entered within by this Jiva — by the Ātman particularised as the cosmic Jiva — Nāmarūpe Vyākaravāni — I shall set forth the variegated creation gods etc, and their names, and for that purpose, of these — light, water and food, that have not attained to mutual contact incompetent to effect particular creations, I shall make each of them three-fold, three-fold, for that power (to create) Therefore, this work of modification in name and form, is the work of the Highest Brahman alone. ॥ 17 ॥

[374] Now it may be (argued) that it is not posible to say that name — form — modification is the doing of the Paramātman, on the ground that there is one agent for the threefold modification, because it is possible for the Jiva to be the doer even of the threefold modification Because the method of threefold modification is mentioned in the case of the Jivas created by the Four-faced one after the creation of the Egg, in (passages)

'यथा खलु सोम्येमास्तिस्रो देवताः पुरुषं प्राप्य त्रिवृत्त्रिवृदेकैका भवति तन्मे विजानीहीति' (छा. ६।४।७)

'अन्नमशितं त्रेधा विधीयते तस्य यः स्थविष्ठो धातुस्तत्पुरीषं भवति यो मध्यमस्तन्मांसं योऽणिष्ठस्तन्मनः' (छा. ६।५।१)

इत्यादिना । तथा पूर्वस्मिन्नपि वाक्ये

'यदग्ने रोहितं रूपं तेजसस्तद्रूपं यच्छुक्लं तदपां यत्कृष्णं तदन्नस्य' (छा. ६।४।१)

इत्यादिना चतुर्मुखसृष्टाग्न्यादित्यचन्द्रविद्युत्सु त्रिवृत्करणं प्रदर्श्यते । नामरूपव्याकरणोत्तरकाले च त्रिवृत्करणं श्रूयते

'सेयं देवतेमास्तिस्रो देवता अनेन जीवेनात्मनानुप्रविश्य नामरूपे व्याकरोत् । तासां त्रिवृतं त्रिवृतमेकैकामकरोत्' (छा. ६।३।३-४)

इति । तत्राह—

मांसादि भौमं यथाशब्दमितरयोश्च ॥ १८ ॥

[375] यदुक्तम्—अण्डसृष्ट्युत्तरकालं चतुर्मुखसृष्टदेवतादिविषयोऽयम्

'तासां त्रिवृतं त्रिवृतमेकैकामकरोत्' (छा. ६।३।४)

इति त्रिवृत्करणोपदेश इति—तन्नोपपद्यते,

'How indeed, gentle one, these three deities having gone to the Puruṣa, become each tripartite, tripartite — know that from me' (Chā 6·4·7)

'The food eaten is specified as threefold; what is its grossest portion, that becomes the secretion; what the middle, the flesh; what the most minute, the mind.' (Chā 6·5·1)

etc. In the same way in the previous passage also,

'What (is) the red form of Agni, that (is) the form of Tejas; what white, that of the Waters; what black, that of Anna' (Chā. 6·4·1)

etc., the threefold modification is indicated in the case of the fire, the Sun, the Moon, the lightning, created by the Fourfaced (Brahmadeva). And the threefold modification is mentioned (in the Śruti) as subsequent to the modification in name and form in (the passage)

'That this Deity, having entered into these three deities by this Living Self, modified name and form, (and) made each of them tripartite, tripartite' (Chā. 6·3·3–4)

etc. — There (the Sūtrakāra) says —

Flesh etc., earthly; and as directly mentioned, of the other two. ॥ 18 ॥

[**375**] As to what has been said that this mention of the threefold modification in

'Made each of those, tripartite, tripartite' (Chā. 6·3·4)

'अन्नमशितं त्रेधा विधीयते' (छा ६।५।१)

इत्यत्र मांसमनसोः पुरीषादणुत्वेनाणीयस्त्वेन च व्यपदिष्टयो' कारणानुविधायित्वेनाप्यतैजसत्वप्रसङ्गात् ।

'आपः पीता' (छा ६।४।२)

इत्यत्रापि मूत्रप्राणयोः स्थविष्ठाणीयसो पार्थिवतैजसत्वप्रसङ्गाच्च । न चैवमिष्यते । मांसादेर्हि भौमत्वमिष्यते पुरीषवत् । मांसमनसी अपि भौमे पार्थिवे इष्येते

'अन्नमशितं त्रेधा' (छा ६।५।१)

इति प्रक्रमात् । यथाशब्दमितरयोश्च—इतरयोरप्यापः पीतास्तेजोऽशितमिति पर्याययोर्यथाशब्दं विकारा इष्यन्ते ।

'आप पीतास्त्रेधा विधीयन्ते' (छा ६।५।२)

इत्यपामेव त्रिधा परिणाम शब्दात्प्रतीयते । तथा

'तेजोऽशितं त्रेधा विधीयते' (छा ६।५।३)

इत्यपि तेजस एव त्रिधा परिणाम' शब्दात्प्रतीयते । अत पुरीषमांसमनांसि पृथिवीविकारा, मूत्रलोहितप्राणा अब्विकारा', अस्थिमज्जावाचस्तेजोविकारा इति प्रतिपत्तव्यम्

---

after the creation of the Egg refers to the deities etc, created by the Fourfaced (Brahmadeva) — that is not proper Because in (the passage) —

'*The food eaten is specified three-fold*' (Cha 6 5 1)

flesh and mind referred to as subtle and subtler (respectively) in respect of the secretion, would have to be possessed of the nature of water and light owing to the persistence of the cause and there would be the undesirable contingency of the gross and subtle urine and Prāna — even in (the passage)

Waters drunk' (Cha. 6 4 2)

— being possessed of the nature of the earth and light But this is not what is desired (by you), for, like the secretion, flesh etc are desired to have earth-nature, the flesh and the mind also are desired to be Bhauma i e earthly, on account of the introductory passage

'*The food eaten, threefold*' (Chā 6 5 1)

Yathāsabdamitarayośca (And of the other two as directly expressed)—of the other two also, — Waters drunk, and light eaten — thus in the case of the two alternatives modifications are desired as expressed in words The threefold transformation of the waters themselves is apprehended directly from the words —

'*The waters drunk are specified threefold*' (Chā. 6 5 2)

Similarly, the threefold transformation of the Light itself is apprehended directly from the words

'*The Light, eaten, is specified threefold*' (Cha 6 5 3)

Therefore the secretion flesh, and mind (are) the modifications of Pṛthivi, urine blood and Prāna (are) the modifications of Waters bones fat, speech (are) the modifications of light — this should be understood, on account of the non contradiction with the remaining part of the passage —

'अन्नमयं हि सोम्य मन आपोमयः प्राणस्तेजोमयी वाक्' (छा. ६।५।४)

इति वाक्यशेषाविरोधाच्च । अतः

'तासां त्रिवृतं त्रिवृतमेकैकामकरोत्' (छा. ६।३।४)

इत्युक्तस्त्रिवृत्करणप्रकारः

'अन्नमशितम्' (छा. ६।५।१)

इत्यादिना न प्रदर्श्यते । तथा सति मनःप्राणवाचां त्रयाणामप्यणीयस्त्वेन तैजसत्वात्

'अन्नमयं हि सोम्य मनः' (छा. ६।५।४)

इत्यादिर्विरुध्यते । प्रागेव त्रिवृत्कृतानां पृथिव्यादीनां पुरुषं प्राप्तानाम्

'अन्नमशितम्' (छा. ६।५।१)

इत्यादिनैकैकस्य त्रेधा परिणाम उच्यते । अण्डसृष्टेः प्रागेव च तेजोबन्नानां त्रिवृत्करणेन भवितव्यम्, अत्रिवृत्कृतानां तेषां कार्यारम्भासामर्थ्यात् । अन्योन्यसंयुक्तानामेव हि कार्यारम्भसामर्थ्यम् । तदेव च त्रिवृत्करणम् । तथा च स्मर्यते

'नानावीर्याः पृथग्भूतास्ततस्ते संहतिं विना ।
नाशक्नुवन्प्रजाः स्रष्टुमसमागम्य कृत्स्नशः ॥

'Gentle one, indeed the mind is constituted of food (Anna); the Prāṇa, constituted of waters; Vāk, constituted of light (Tejas)' (Chā. 6·5·4)

Therefore, the method of threefold modification mentioned in

'Of them (the Parā Devatā) made each of them tripartite, tripartite' (Chā. 6·3·4)

is not indicated by

'The food, eaten' (Chā. 6·5·1)

etc. In that case, the mind, Prāṇa and speech, —all the three being constituted of light, being subtle, there would be contradiction with

'Constituted of Anna, indeed, gentle one, (is) the mind' (Chā. 6·5·4)

etc. — By the passage

'The food, eaten' (Chā. 6·5·1)

etc., is mentioned the threefold modification of each one, the earth etc. reaching the Purusa, that have already been modified in name and form. And *the threefold modification of light, water, Anna, has got to be already there* prior to the creation of the Egg, because they, not modified threefold, have no strength to begin (their) work. The strength to begin their work, is there only when they come together. And that same is the threefold modification. To the same effect is the statement in the Smrti —

'They then, possessed of various powers, remaining separate, were not able to create peoples, without coming together, not uniting as a whole.

'अन्नमशितं त्रेधा विधीयते' (छा ६।५।१)

इत्यत्र मांसमनसोः पुरीषादणुत्वेनाणीयस्त्वेन च व्यपदिष्टयोः कारणानुविधायित्वेनाप्यतैजसत्व-प्रसङ्गात्।

'आपः पीता' (छा ६।४।२)

इत्यत्रापि मूत्रप्राणयोः स्थविष्ठाणीयसो पार्थिवतैजसत्वप्रसङ्गाच्च। न चैवमिष्यते। मांसादेर्हि भौमत्वमिष्यते पुरीषवत्। मांसमनसी अपि भौमे पार्थिवे इष्येते

'अन्नमशितं त्रेधा' (छा ६।५।१)

इति प्रक्रमात्। यथाशब्दमितरयोश्च—इतरयोरप्यापः पीतास्तेजोऽशितमिति पर्याययोर्यथाशब्दं विकारा इष्यन्ते।

'आपः पीतास्त्रेधा विधीयन्ते' (छा ६।५।२)

इत्यपामेव त्रिधा परिणामः शब्दात्प्रतीयते। तथा

'तेजोऽशितं त्रेधा विधीयते' (छा ६।५।३)

इत्यपि तेजस एव त्रिधा परिणामः शब्दात्प्रतीयते। अतः पुरीषमांसमनांसि पृथिवीविकाराः, मूत्रलोहितप्राणा अब्विकाराः, अस्थिमज्जावाचस्तेजोविकारा इति प्रतिपत्तव्यम्

---

after the creation of the Egg, refers to the deities etc, created by the Fourfaced (Brahmadeva) — that is not proper Because in (the passage) —

'The food eaten is specified three-fold' (Chā 6·5 1)

flesh and mind, referred to as subtle and subtler (respectively) in respect of the secretion, would have to be possessed of the nature of water and light, owing to the persistence of the cause and there would be the undesirable contingency of the gross and subtle urine and Prāna — even in (the passage)

'Waters drunk' (Chā. 6 4 2)

— being possessed of the nature of the earth and light But this is not what is desired (by you), for, like the secretion, flesh etc, are desired to have earth-nature, the flesh and the mind also are desired to be Bhauma i e earthly, on account of the introductory passage

'The food eaten, threefold.' (Chā 6 5 1)

Yathāsabdamitarayośca (And of the other two as directly expressed)—of the other two also, — Waters drunk, and light eaten — thus in the case of the two alternatives modifications are desired as expressed in words The threefold transformation of the waters themselves is apprehended directly from the words —

'The waters drunk are specified threefold' (Chā. 6·5 2)

Similarly, the threefold transformation of the Light itself is apprehended directly from the words

'The Light, eaten is specified threefold' (Chā 6 5 3)

Therefore, the secretion, flesh, and mind (are) the modifications of Pṛthivi urine, blood and Prāna (are) the modifications of Waters, bones, fat, speech (are) the modifications of light — this should be understood, on account of the non contradiction with the remaining part of the passage —

'अन्नमयं हि सोम्य मन आपोमयः प्राणस्तेजोमयी वाक्' (छा. ६।५।४)

इति वाक्यशेषाविरोधाच्च । अतः

'तासां त्रिवृतं त्रिवृतमेकैकामकरोत्' (छा. ६।३।४)

इत्युक्तात्रिवृत्करणप्रकारः

'अन्नमशितम्' (छा. ६।५।१)

इत्यादिना न प्रदर्श्यते । तथा सति मनःप्राणवाचां त्रयाणामप्यणीयस्त्वेन तैजसत्वात्

'अन्नमयं हि सोम्य मनः' (छा. ६।५।४)

इत्यादिर्विरुध्यते । प्रागेव त्रिवृत्कृतानां पृथिव्यादीनां पुरुषं प्राप्तानाम्

'अन्नमशितम्' (छा. ६।५।१)

इत्यादिनैकैकस्य त्रेधा परिणाम उच्यते । अण्डसृष्टेः प्रागेव च तेजोबन्नानां त्रिवृत्करणेन भवितव्यम्, अत्रिवृत्कृतानां तेषां कार्यारम्भासामर्थ्यात् । अन्योन्यसंयुक्तानामेव हि कार्यारम्भसामर्थ्यम् । तदेव च त्रिवृत्करणम् । तथा च स्मर्यते

'नानावीर्याः पृथग्भूतास्ततस्ते संहतिं विना ।
नाशक्नुवन्प्रजाः स्रष्टुमसमागम्य कृत्स्नशः ॥

'Gentle one, indeed the mind is constituted of food (Anna); the Prāṇa, constituted of waters; Vāk, constituted of light (Tejas)' (Chā. 6·5·4)

Therefore, the method of threefold modification mentioned in

'Of them (the Parā Devatā) made each of them tripartite, tripartite' (Chā. 6·3·4)

is not indicated by

'The food, eaten' (Chā. 6·5·1)

etc. In that case, the mind, Prāṇa and speech, —all the three being constituted of light, being subtle, there would be contradiction with

'Constituted of Anna, indeed, gentle one, (is) the mind' (Chā. 6·5·4)

etc. — By the passage

'The food, eaten' (Chā. 6·5·1)

etc., is mentioned the threefold modification of each one, the earth etc. reaching the Purusa, that have already been modified in name and form. And the threefold modification of light, water, Anna, has got to be already there prior to the creation of the Egg, because they, not modified threefold, have no strength to begin (their) work. The strength to begin their work, is there only when they come together. And that same is the threefold modification. To the same effect is the statement in the Smṛti—

'They then, possessed of various powers, remaining separate, were not able to create peoples, without coming together, not uniting as a whole.

समेत्यान्योन्यसंयोगं परस्परसमाश्रयाः ।
महदाद्या विशेषान्ता ह्यण्डमुत्पादयन्ति ते ॥' (वि पु. १।२।५०, ५२)

इति । अत एव च

'अनेन जीवेनात्मनानुप्रविश्य नामरूपे व्याकरोत् । तासां त्रिवृतं त्रिवृतमेकैकामकरोत्' (छा. ६।३।३-४)

इति पाठक्रमोऽर्थक्रमेण बाध्यते । अण्डान्तर्वर्तिष्वग्न्यादित्यादिषु त्रिवृत्करणप्रदर्शनं श्वेतकेतोः शुश्रूषोरण्डान्तर्वर्तित्वेन तस्य बहिष्ठवस्तुषु त्रिवृत्करणप्रदर्शनायोगात्त्रिवृत्कृतानां कार्येष्वग्न्यादित्यादिषु क्रियते ॥ १८ ॥

[376] स्यादेतत्—

'अन्नमशितम्' (छा ६।५।१)
'आपः पीताः' (छा ६।५।२)
'तेजोऽशितम्' (छा. ६।५।३)

इति त्रिवृत्कृतानामन्नादीनामेकैकस्य तेजोबन्नात्मकत्वेन त्रिरूपस्य कथमन्नमापस्तेज इत्येकैकरूपेण व्यपदेश उपपद्यते ? इति । तत्राह—

वैशेष्यात्तु तद्वादस्तद्वादः ॥ १९ ॥

On coming together in mutual contact, resorting to one another, they indeed create the Egg, beginning with Mahat and ending with Particularity' (V. P. 1·2·50, 52)

— For this very reason, the order in the passages is contradicted by the order of the sense, in (the passage) —

'Having entered into with the Living Self, it modified name and form, of them, it made each of them tripartite, tripartite.' (Chā. 6·3·3–4)

The exhibition (statement) about the threefold modification in the case of the fire, the Sun, etc , abiding within the Egg, is made in respect of the fire, the Sun etc , the effects of the threefold modified, on account of the impossibility of the exhibition of the threefold modification in the case of the outside objects, for the serious student Svetaketu, as he himself was abiding within the Egg ॥ 18 ॥

[**376**] This may be (objected to by the objector) — How is the mention appropriate, of food, etc, modified threefold, in (the passages)

'Anna, eaten' (Chā. 6 5·1)
'Waters, drunk' (Chā. 6·5 2)
'Tejas, eaten' (Chā. 6·5·3)

— each one of them, of three forms, being constituted of light, waters and Anna — as of one form each — as Anna, Waters and Tejas ? There (the Sūtrakāra) says —

But on account of the speciality, that designation, that designation ॥ 19 ॥

वैशेष्यं—विशेषभावः । त्रिवृत्करणेन त्रिरूपेऽप्येकैकस्मिन्नन्नाद्याधिक्यात्तत्र तत्रान्नादिवादः । द्विरुक्तिरध्यायपरिसमाप्तिं द्योतयति ॥ १९ ॥

संज्ञामूर्तिक्लृप्त्यधिकरणं समाप्तम् (८)

इति श्रीमद्भगवद्रामानुजाचार्यविरचिते शारीरकमीमांसाभाष्ये द्वितीयाध्यायस्य चतुर्थः पादः समाप्तः ॥

समाप्तश्चायं द्वितीयोऽध्यायः ॥

Vaiśesyam — speciality. Although each one (of these) has three forms owing to the threefold modification, there is the designation Anna etc., in the various cases, on account of the preponderance of food etc. The twofold repetition indicates the conclusion of the Chapter. ॥ 19 ॥

Here ends the Saṁjñāmūrtiklptyadhikaraṇa (8)

Here ends the Fourth Quarter of the Second Chapter in the Commentary on the Śārīraka-mīmāṁsā composed by the Illustrious Revered Preceptor Rāmānuja.

Here ends also the Second Chapt

तृतीयाध्याये प्रथमः पादः ।

तदन्तरप्रतिपत्तौ रंहति संपरिष्वक्तः प्रश्ननिरूपणाभ्याम् ॥ १ ॥

(अधिकरण १, सूत्राणि १–७)

[377] अतिक्रान्ताध्यायद्वयेन निखिलजगदेककारणं निरस्तनिखिलदोषगन्धम्, अपरिमितोदारगुणसागरं सकलेतरविलक्षणं परं ब्रह्म मुमुक्षुभिरुपास्यतया वेदान्ताः प्रतिपादयन्ति-इत्ययमर्थः स्मृतिन्यायविरोधपरिहारपरपक्षप्रतिक्षेपवेदान्तवाक्यपरस्परविरोधपरिहाररूपकार्यस्वरूपसंशोधनैस्तद्दूषणत्वहेतुभिः सह स्थापितः । अतोऽध्यायद्वयेन ब्रह्मस्वरूपं प्रतिपादितम् । उत्तरेणेदानीं तत्प्राप्त्युपायैः सह प्राप्तिप्रकारश्चिन्तयितुमिष्यते ।

तत्र तृतीयेऽध्याय उपायभूतोपासनविषया चिन्ता वर्तते । उपासनारम्भाभ्यर्हितोपायश्च प्राप्यवस्तुव्यतिरिक्तवैतृष्ण्यं प्राप्यतृष्णा च, इति तत्सिद्ध्यर्थं जीवस्य लोकान्तरेषु संचरतो जाग्रतः स्वपतः सुषुप्तस्य मूर्च्छितश्च दोषाः, परस्य च ब्रह्मणस्तद्रहितता कल्याणगुणाकरता च प्रथमद्वितीययोः पादयोः प्रतिपाद्यते—

First Quarter of the Third Chapter

While taking to another (body the Jiva), goes as enveloped, on account of the question and the exposition. ‖ 1 ‖

(Adhikarana 1, Sūtras 1-7)

[377] In the previous two Chapters the matter viz that the Vedāntas propound as the object of worship by those desirous of salvation, the Highest Brahman which is the one cause of the entire world with (even) the tinge of all blemishes removed, the ocean of unlimited noble qualities, and which is different from everything else, has been established by the scrutinies of various aspects of the business in hand, in the form of the removal of the contradictions due to (i e based upon) Smrtis, and logic, the attacks by the opponents, the removal of mutual contradictions of the Vedānta passages, — along with the arguments for the uprooting of the same Thus in the two Chapters, has been propounded the nature of Brahman • And now by the succeeding (portion), it is intended to consider the mode of the attainment, and the means for its attainment

There in the third Chapter is the consideration referring to worship as the means And as the means desired for the beginning of worship is desirelessness for the things other than the destination, and passionate desire for the destination, — for the accomplishment of that, are propounded in the first and second Quarters, the blemishes belonging to the Jiva moving in the different worlds—waking, dreaming, sleeping (soundly), and fainting (in swoon), and the absence of those and being the mine of (all) auspicious qualities in the case of the Highest Brahman

तत्र देहाद्देहान्तरं गच्छन्नयं जीवो देहान्तरारम्भहेतुभिर्भूतसूक्ष्मैः संपरिष्वक्त एव गच्छति, उत न, इति चिन्तायां यत्र यत्र जीवो याति तत्र तत्र भूतसूक्ष्माणां सुलभत्वात्, असंपरिष्वक्तो यातीति प्राप्तम्। पश्चादपि पूर्वपक्षबीजान्युपन्यस्य निरसिष्यति। तत्र सिद्धान्तमाह–तदन्तरप्रतिपत्तौ रंहति संपरिष्वक्तः, इति।

'संज्ञामूर्तिक्लृप्तिः' (ब्र. सू. २।४।१७)

इति मूर्तिशब्देन देहः प्रस्तुतः, स तच्छब्देन परामृश्यते। तदन्तरप्रतिपत्तौ—देहान्तरगमने भूतसूक्ष्मैः संपरिष्वक्तो जीवो रंहति गच्छतीत्यर्थः। कुतः? प्रश्ननिरूपणाभ्याम्—प्रश्नप्रतिवचनाभ्याम्। पञ्चाग्निविद्यायामेवं प्रश्नप्रतिवचने आम्नायेते—

श्वेतकेतुं किलारुणेयं पाञ्चालः प्रवाहणः कर्मिणां गन्तव्यदेशं पुनरावृत्तिप्रकारं देवयानपितृयाणपथव्यावर्तने, अमुष्य लोकस्याप्रातारं च वेत्थ? इति पृष्ट्वेदमपि पप्रच्छ—

'वेत्थ यथा पञ्चम्यामाहुतावापः पुरुषवचसो भवन्ति' (छा. ५।३।३)

इति। तत्रेमं पश्चिमं प्रश्नं प्रतिब्रुवंश्च द्युलोकमग्नित्वेन रूपयित्वा

'तस्मिन्नेतस्मिन्नग्नौ देवाः श्रद्धां जुह्वति तस्या आहुतेः सोमो राजा संभवति' (छा. ५।४।२)

There, this Jiva going from one body to another goes, verily, as enveloped by the subtle elements, the causes of the production of another body, or not — this being considered, this (prima-facie view) is reached, viz. wherever the Jiva goes, in those places the subtle elements being easy to find, he goes (there) not enveloped by them. — Later on also, after introducing the opponent's points (seeds of the prima-facie view) (the Sūtrakāra) would refute them—And there (in the present case) he mentions the right view—While taking to another (body, the Jiva) goes as enveloped.

By the word Mūrti in (the expression—Saṁjñāmūrtiklpti)

'Name, form, modification' (Bra. Sū. II. 4·17)

the body is referred to, and that is indicated by the word Tat Tadantarapratipattau — in taking to another body, enveloped by the subtle elements, Jiva, Raṁhati — goes — this (is) the sense. Whence? Praśnanirūpaṇābhyām—from the question and answer. In the Section dealing with the Pañcāgnividyā there are these questions and answers —

Pāñcāla Pravāhaṇa having indeed asked Śvetaketu, the son of Āruṇi — Do you know the place to which the performers of sacrifice are to go, the mode of their return, the return from the paths—Devayāna and Pitṛyāṇa—and him who does not reach the other world, asked this also—

'Do you know how waters in, the fifth oblation become designated as man?' (Chā 5·3·3)

And there, replying to this last question, having identified the heaven-world with fire, and in (the passage) —

'There in this fire, the gods offer Śraddhā as the oblation; from that oblation King Soma is born' (Chā. 5·4·2)

etc.,—in the heaven-world looked upon as fire, the Prāṇas of the Jiva, called gods, throw the object called Śraddhā; and that Śraddhā is modified in the

इत्यादिना देवाख्या जीवस्य प्राणा अग्नित्वेन रूपिते द्युलोके श्रद्धाख्यं वस्तु प्रक्षिपन्ति। सा च श्रद्धा सोमराजाख्यामृतमयदेहरूपेण परिणमते। तं चामृतमयं देहं त एव प्राणाः पर्जन्येऽग्नित्वरूपिते प्रक्षिपन्ति। स च देहस्तत्र प्रक्षिप्तो वर्षं भवति। तच्च वर्षं त एव प्राणाः पृथिव्यामग्नित्वरूपितायां प्रक्षिपन्ति। तच्च तत्र प्रक्षिप्तमन्नं भवति। तच्चान्नं त एव पुरुषेऽग्नित्वरूपिते प्रक्षिपन्ति। तच्च तत्र रेतो भवति। तच्च त एव योषायामग्नित्वरूपितायां प्रक्षिपन्ति। तच्च तत्र प्रक्षिप्तं गर्भो भवतीत्युक्त्वाह—

'इति तु पञ्चम्यामाहुतावापः पुरुषवचसो भवन्ति' (छा ५।९।१)

इति। एवं पञ्चम्यामाहुतौ हुतायामापः पुरुषशब्दाभिलप्या भवन्तीत्यर्थः। एवमुक्ते पूर्वास्वप्याहुतिष्वनुवर्तमानानामेवापां सूक्ष्मरूपाणामिदानीं पुरुषाकारत्वं भवतीत्युक्तं भवति। अत एवं प्रश्नप्रतिवचनाभ्यां देहहेतुभूतैर्भूतसूक्ष्मैः सह तत्र तत्र यातीति गम्यते ॥ १ ॥

[378] ननु

'आपः पुरुषवचसः' (छा ५।९।१)

इत्युक्तेऽपां पुरुषाकारपरिणामप्रतीतेर्गच्छता जीवेन तासामेव परिष्वङ्गः प्रतीयते। अतः कथं सर्वेषां भूतसूक्ष्माणां परिष्वङ्गः? इत्यतः प्राह—

त्र्यात्मकत्वात्तु भूयस्त्वात् ॥ २ ॥

तुशब्दश्चोद्यं व्यावर्तयति। देहारम्भिकाणामपां केवलानां न देहारम्भसंभवः। देहा-

---

form of a body formed of ambrosia, called Somarāja and that body formed of ambrosia the same Pranas throw in Parjanya (rain) looked upon as fire, and that body thrown there becomes a shower of rain, and that shower of rain, the same Prānas throw on the earth looked upon as fire, and that thrown there becomes the food, and that food, the same (Prānas) throw in man (Purusa) looked upon as fire, and that (food) becomes there the semen, and that the same throw into the woman looked upon as fire, and that same thrown there becomes the foetus — having said thus, says he

'Thus again, in the fifth libation the waters become designated as man' (Chā 5 9·1)

In this way, when the fifth libation (oblation) is offered, the waters become fit for being called by the word Man When it is stated thus, it is as good as stated of waters having a subtle form existing even in the previous libations, that there is for them now a human form For this reason, owing to the question and the answer, thus it is known that (the Jiva) goes to the various places along with the subtle elements which are the producing causes of the body ॥ 1 ॥

[378] I say (says the objector) — When it is stated

'Waters are designated as man' (Chā 5 9 1)

on account of the apprehension of the waters being modified in a human form, it is known that there is the close contact with the moving Jiva of them only. Therefore, how is there the close contact with all the subtle elements? — Therefore (the Sūtrakāra) says —

But on account of the preponderance, due to being three-fold. ॥ 2 ॥

The word Tu turns away the objection There is no possibility of the production of the body, by merely the waters as its producing cause, for, it is

द्यारम्भायैव हि

'तासां त्रिवृतं त्रिवृतमेकैकाम्' (छा. ६।३।३)

इति त्रिवृत्करणम्। केवलानामपां श्रवणं तु तासां भूयस्त्वात्। देहे च लोहितादिभूयस्त्वेनारम्भकेष्वपां भूयस्त्वं गम्यते ॥ २ ॥

प्राणगतेश्च ॥ ३ ॥

इतश्च भूतसूक्ष्मपरिष्वक्तस्य गमनमिति गम्यते। उत्क्रामति जीवे प्राणानां तदनुगतिः श्रूयते

'तमुत्क्रामन्तं प्राणोऽनूत्क्रामति प्राणमनूत्क्रामन्तं सर्वे प्राणा अनूत्क्रामन्ति' (बृ. ४।४।२)

इति। स्मर्यते च

'मनःषष्ठानीन्द्रियाणि प्रकृतिस्थानि कर्षति ॥
शरीरं यदवाप्नोति यच्चाप्युत्क्रामतीश्वरः।
गृहीत्वैतानि संयाति वायुर्गन्धानिवाशयात् ॥' (गीता १५।७–८)

इति। न च निराश्रयाणां गतिरुपपद्यत इति तदाश्रयभूतानां भूतसूक्ष्माणामपि गतिरभ्युपगन्तव्या ॥ ३ ॥

[379] अग्न्यादिगतिश्रुतेरिति चेन्न भाक्तत्वात् ॥ ४ ॥

---

for the sake of producing the body etc., that there is the threefold modification in

'Of those, each one, tripartite, tripartite.' (Chā. 6·3·3)

The mention in the Śruti, of the waters only, is on account of their being preponderant. And owing to the preponderance of blood etc., in the body, it is known that there is the preponderance of water in the producing causes ॥ 2 ॥

And on account of the movement of the Prāṇas ॥ 3 ॥

From this also, it is known that there is the going out (of the Jīva) as enveloped by the subtle elements. When the Jīva is departing, it is mentioned in the Śruti that the Prāṇas go after him, in

'Him departing, Prāṇa departs after; all (other) Prāṇas depart after the departing Prāṇa' (Bṛ. 4·4·2)

And it is mentioned in the Smṛti —

'He drags the (five) sense-organs with mind as the sixth, stationed in Prakṛti; what body he secures, and what he departs from, the Ruler (Jīva) goes away taking these, like the wind, the odours from (their) resort.' (Gītā 15·7–8)

And because no movement is possible in the case of those with no resort, movement of even those subtle elements that resort to him, has also got to be admitted. ॥ 3 ॥

[379] If (it be argued) on account of the statement in the Śruti about merging into Agni etc., (the Prāṇas do not depart with the Jīva, — we reply) — No, on account of that being metaphorical. ॥ 4 ॥

'*यत्रास्य पुरुषस्य मृतस्याग्निं वागप्येति वातं प्राणश्चक्षुरादित्यम्*'
(बृ. ३।२।१३)

इत्यादिना प्राणानां जीवमरणकालेऽग्न्यादिष्वप्ययश्रवणात्, न तेषां जीवेन सह गमनमिति गतिश्रुतिरन्यथा नेया, इति चेत्--न, भाक्तत्वादग्न्यादिष्वप्ययश्रवणस्य। कथं भाक्तत्वम्?
'*ओषधीर्लोमानि वनस्पतीन्केशाः*'　　(बृ. ३।२।१३)

इत्यनपियद्भिर्लोमादिभिः सह श्रवणात्। अतः चक्षुराद्यप्ययश्रुतिरधिष्ठातृदेवतापक्रमणपरा ॥ ४ ॥

प्रथमे श्रवणादिति चेन्न ता एव ह्युपपत्तेः ॥ ५ ॥

[380] यदुक्तमद्भिः सूक्ष्माभिर्भूतान्तरसंसृष्टाभिः परिष्वक्तो जीवो गच्छतीति प्रश्नप्रतिवचनाभ्यामवगम्यत इति,—तन्नोपपद्यते, द्युलोकाग्निविषये प्रथमे होमेऽपां होम्यत्वाश्रवणात्।
'*तस्मिन्नेतस्मिन्नग्नौ देवाः श्रद्धां जुह्वति*'　　(छा. ५।४।२)

इति श्रद्धैव होम्यत्वेन श्रुता। श्रद्धा नाम जीवस्य मनोवृत्तिविशेषत्वेन प्रसिद्धा। अतो नापस्तत्र होम्याः, इति चेत्—न, यतस्ता आप एव श्रद्धाशब्देन तत्राभिधीयन्ते। कुतः? प्रश्न-

---

If it be argued that — because in (the passage)

'Where of this person dead, speech goes unto fire; Prāna unto Wind; eye unto Āditya'　　(Br. 3·2·13)

etc., — it is mentioned that the Prānas go unto Agni etc., at the time of the death of the Jīva, they can not be going along with the Jīva and so, the Sruti referring to their movement must be construed otherwise—(We reply) —No, because the description in the Śruti about going unto the fire etc., is metaphorical. How (is it) metaphorical?—(the answer is)—they do not go. Because there is that Śruti-statement, along with the hair etc., not merging.

'Small (soft) hair unto the herbs, the long hair unto the plants.'　　(Br. 3·2·13)

Therefore, the Sruti mentioning the merging of the eye etc., refers to the going away of the supervising deity. ‖4‖

If (it is said) that, on account of the non-mention in the first—no, they (waters) alone are denoted there), on account of propriety. ‖5‖

[380] As to what has been said that the Jiva goes enveloped by the subtle waters connected with other elements,—this is known from the question and answer,—that is not proper, on account of the non-mention in the Śruti, of the waters being the oblation in the first sacrifice in the heavenly-world-fire. Śraddhā alone is mentioned as being the offering, in the Śruti

'In that, this fire, the gods offer Śraddhā as the oblation.'
(Chā. 5·4·2)

Śraddhā, indeed, is well-known as being a special attitude of the mind, of the Jīva; so, waters are not the oblations there—if (it be argued) thus—(the answer is)—No. Because those self-same waters are denoted by the word

प्रतिवचनोपपत्तेः ।

'वेत्थ यथा पञ्चम्यामाहुतावापः पुरुषवचसो भवन्ति' (छा. ५।३।३)

इति प्रश्नस्य प्रतिवचनोपक्रमे श्रद्धा द्युलोकाग्नौ होम्यत्वेन श्रुता । तत्र यदि श्रद्धाशब्देनापो नोच्येरन्, ततोऽन्यथा प्रश्नोऽन्यथा प्रतिवचनमित्यसंगतं स्यात् ।

'इति तु पञ्चम्यामाहुतावापः पुरुषवचसः' (छा. ५।९।१)

इति प्रतिवचने निगमनं च श्रद्धाया अप्त्वमेव सूचयति ।

'वेत्थ यथा' (छा. ५।३।३)

इति हि प्रश्नगतः प्रकारः

'इति तु पञ्चम्याम्' (छा. ५।९।१)

इति, इतिशब्देन परिहारो निगम्यते । श्रद्धासोमराजवर्षान्नरेतोगर्भरूपेणापां परिणाममुक्त्वा ह्येवम्, आपः पुरुषवचसः—इति निगम्यते । श्रद्धाशब्दस्य चाप्सु वैदिकः प्रयोगो दृश्यते

'अपः प्रणयति । श्रद्धा वा आपः' (तै. ब्रा. ३।२।४)

इति ।

'श्रद्धां जुह्वति तस्या आहुतेः सोमो राजा संभवति' (छा. ५।४।२)

इति सोमाकारेण परिणामश्चापामेवोपपद्यते । अतो भूतान्तरसंसृष्टाभिरद्भिः संपरिष्वक्तो जीवो

Śraddhā. Whence? On account of the propriety of question and answer. In the initial part of the answer to the question

'Do you know how in the fifth libation, waters come to be called a human being?' (Chā. 5·3·3)

Sraddhā is spoken of in the Sruti, as the oblation in the fire, the heaven-world. If there, waters were not to be denoted by the word Śraddhā, then (the result would be)—another question, another answer,—and thus, everything would be disjointed. In the answer

'Thus in the fifth libation, the waters come to be called a human being' (Chā. 5·9·1)

the conclusion again indicates that Sraddhā has the nature of waters alone. In (the expression)

'Do you know how' (Chā. 5·3·3)

there is the mode of the question and in (the passage)

'Thus in the fifth' (Chā. 5·9·1)

by the word Iti is concluded the answer. Having indeed mentioned the modification of the waters, in the form of Sraddhā, Somarāja, shower of rain, food, semen and foetus,—in this way, it is concluded that the waters come to be called a human being. The use of the word Śraddhā in the Vedas, in the sense of waters, is seen in

'He takes the waters; Śraddhā indeed, is waters.' (Tai. Brā. 3·2·4)

The modification in the form of Soma, of the waters alone is appropriate, in

'He offers Śraddhā in the sacrifice; from that offering, comes into being Soma, King' (Chā. 5·4·2)

रंहतीत्युपपन्नम् ॥ ५ ॥

अश्रुतत्वादिति चेन्नेष्टादिकारिणां प्रतीतेः ॥ ६ ॥

[381] यत्पुनरुक्तम्–अद्भिः संपरिष्वक्तो जीवो यातीत्ययमर्थः, एतस्माद्वाक्यादवगम्यत, इति–तन्नोपपद्यते, अस्मिन्वाक्ये जीवस्याश्रवणात्। अत्र हि श्रद्धादय एवाम्ब्ववस्थाविशेषा होम्यत्वेन श्रुताः, न तु जीवस्तत्परिष्वक्तः, इति चेत्–तन्न, इष्टादिकारिणां प्रतीतेः। तस्मिन्नेव वाक्ये ह्युत्तरत्र ब्रह्मज्ञानविधुरेष्टापूर्तदत्तकारिणो द्युलोकं प्राप्य सोमराजानो भवन्तीति पुण्यकर्मावसाने च पुनरागत्य गर्भं प्राप्नुवन्तीत्युच्यते।

'अथ य इमे ग्राम इष्टापूर्ते दत्तमित्युपासते ते धूममभिसंभवन्ति'

(छा. ५।१०।३)

इत्यारभ्य

'पितृलोकादाकाशमाकाशाच्चन्द्रमसमेष सोमो राजा तद्देवानामन्नं तं देवा भक्षयन्ति। तस्मिन्यावत्संपातमुषित्वाथैतमेवाध्वानं पुनर्निवर्तन्ते।...यो यो ह्यन्नमत्ति यो यो रेतः सिञ्चति तद्भूय एव भवति'　　(छा. ५।१०।४-५-६)

इति। अत्रापि द्युलोकाग्नौ

Therefore, it is appropriate that the Jiva goes, enveloped all round by waters mixed with other elements. ॥ 5 ॥

On account of (this) not being mentioned in the Śruti—if (it be objected) thus, (our reply is) No—on account of the apprehension of those who perform sacrificial deeds etc. ॥ 6 ॥

[381] As to what again has been said that the Jiva goes, being enveloped all round by the waters—this sense is understood from this passage—it is not appropriate on account of the Jiva not being mentioned is this passage. For, here Śraddhā etc., alone in the particular watery state, are mentioned in the Śruti, as the offering but not the Jiva enveloped by them—If it is objectd thus, (our reply is) — No, on account of the apprehension of those who perform sacrificial deeds etc.,—for, in that same passage further on, it has been said that those who go in for sacrificial and pious deeds, and gifts but without the knowledge of Brahman, having reached the heavenly world become Somarājas; and with the holy merit come to an end, having come back again become the foetus.—Beginning with

'Now those who worship in the village taking to sacrificial and pious deeds and gifts, they go unto the smoke'　　(Chā. 5·10·3)

and ending with

'From the world of the Pitrs, to Ākāśa; from Ākāśa, to the Moon; this Soma-King (is) the food for the gods; him the gods eat.' Staying there till falling down, then they return again by this same path. Whosoever eats 'food, whosoever sprinkles semen, does become that again.'　　(Chā. 5·10·4–6)

Here also, in the heaven-world-fire

'श्रद्धां जुह्वति तस्या आहुतेः सोमो राजा संभवति' (छा. ५।४।२)

इति तदेकार्थत्वाच्छ्रद्धावस्थदेहविशिष्टः सोमरूपदेहविशिष्टो भवतीत्युक्तमिति गम्यते। देहस्य जीवविशेषणतैकस्वरूपस्य वाचकः शब्दो विशेष्ये जीव एव पर्यवस्यति। अतः संपरिष्वक्तो जीवो याति, इत्युपपद्यते ॥ ६ ॥

[382] ननु च

'तं देवा भक्षयन्ति' (छा. ५।१०।४)

इति देवैर्भक्ष्यमाणत्ववचनात्सोमो राजेति न जीव उच्यते, जीवस्यानदनीयत्वात्। तत्राह—

भाक्तं वानात्मवित्त्वात्तथा हि दर्शयति ॥ ७ ॥

वाशब्दश्चोद्यं व्यावर्तयति। इष्टादिकारिणोऽनात्मवित्त्वात्स देवानां भोगोपकरणत्वेनेहामुत्र च वर्तते। इहेष्टादिना तदाराधनं कुर्वन्नुपकरोति। आराधनप्रीतैर्देवैर्दत्तममुं लोकं प्राप्य तत्र तत्समानभोगस्तदुपकरणं भवति। यथा

'पशुरेवं स देवानाम्' (बृ १।४।१०)

इत्यनात्मविदो देवानामुपकरणत्वं दर्शयति श्रुतिः। स्मृतिरप्यात्मविदां ब्रह्मप्राप्तिमनात्मविदां च देवभोग्यत्वं दर्शयति

'They offer Śraddhā; from that offering comes into being Soma-King' (Chā. 5·4·2)

—this having the same sense, it is known that what is said is that he particularised by the body in the state of Śraddhā, becomes particularised by the body in the form of Soma. The word denoting the body having the sole nature of being the attribute of the Jīva, ultimately applies to the qualified Jiva himself. Thus, it is appropriate that the Jīva goes being enveloped all round. ‖ 6 ‖

[382] I say again (says the objector)—in (the passage)

'Him the gods eat' (Chā. 5·10·4)

Jīva cannot be said to be Soma-King on account of the statement of his being eaten up by the gods, because Jīva is unfit to be eaten—There (the Sūtrakāra) says—

But (the statement is) metaphorical owing to their being not Ātman-knowers; for, (the Śruti) indicates to that effect. ‖ 7 ‖

The word Vā turns away the objection—on account of the performer of the sacrificial rites etc, being not an Atman-knower, he remains here as well as in the other world as an instrument of enjoyment for the gods. Here (on this earth), he obliges by worshipping them by the sacrificial rites etc. Having reached a particular world, vouchsafed by the gods pleased with his worship, he has common enjoyments with them, and becomes the instrument for them. As (for instance) in

'He becomes thus a beast for the Gods' (Br. 1·4·10)

—the Sruti points out to the non-Ātman-knower as the instrument for the gods. The Smṛti also points out to the acquisition of Brahman by the Ātman-knowers, and being an object of enjoyment for the gods, in the case of those not knowing the Ātman in (passages like)

'देवान्देवयजो यान्ति मद्भक्ता यान्ति मामपि ।' (गीता ७।२३)

इति । अतो जीवस्य देवानां भोगोपकरणत्वाभिप्रायमन्नत्वेन भक्ष्यत्ववचनम् । अतस्तद्भाक्तम् । तेन तृप्तिरेव च देवानां भक्षणमिति श्रूयते

'न ह वै देवा अश्नन्ति न पिबन्त्येतदेवामृतं दृष्ट्वा तृप्यन्ति' (छा. ३।६।१)

इति । तस्माद्भूतसूक्ष्मैः संपरिष्वक्तो जीवो रंहतीति सिद्धम् ॥ ७ ॥

तदन्तरप्रतिपत्त्यधिकरणं समाप्तम् (१)

कृतात्ययेऽनुशयवान्दृष्टस्मृतिभ्यां यथेतमनेवं च ॥ ८ ॥

(अधिकरण २, सूत्राणि ८–११)

[383] केवलेष्टापूर्तदत्तकारिणां धूमादिना पितृयाणेन पथा गमनं कर्मफलावसाने पुनरावर्तनं चाम्नातम्

'यावत्संपातमुषित्वाथैतमेवाध्वानं पुनर्निवर्तन्ते' (छा. ५।१०।५)

इति । तत्र प्रत्यवरोहञ्जीवः किमनुशयवान्प्रत्यवरोहति, उत न ? इति संशय्यते । किं युक्तम् ? कर्मणः कृत्स्नस्योपभुक्तत्वान्नानुशयवानिति प्राप्तम् । अनुशयो ह्युपभुक्तशिष्टं कर्म । तच्च कृत्स्नफलोपभोगे सति नावशिष्यते ।

'The worshippers of the gods go to the gods; my worshippers go unto me also' (Gītā 7·23)

Therefore, the description of Jīva as fit to be eaten as the food of the gods, is intended to point out to his being the means of their enjoyment. Therefore, it is metaphorical. So, the gratification alone of the gods is mentioned by the Śruti as the eating by them—

'Not indeed, do the gods eat, nor do the gods drink; they are gratified by seeing this immortal itself.' (Chā. 3·6·1)

Therefore, it is proved that the Jīva goes, enveloped all round by the subtle elements. ॥ 7 ॥

Here ends the Tadantarapratipattyadhikaraṇa (1)

On the exhaustion of the Karman, he possessed of a remainder: on account of the Śruti and the Smṛti; as he goes, not so (returns he) ॥ 8 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 2, Sūtras 8–11)

[383] It has been mentioned in the Sruti that those who are performers only of sacrificial and pious deeds, and give gifts, go by the Pitṛyāna path beginning with smoke etc, and come back again, when the fruit of the Karman is exhausted—

'Having stayed there till falling down, — then they return again by this very path' (Chā. 5·10·5)

—There a doubt is raised—Does the Jīva descending, descend possessed of some remainder (of the holy merit), or not? What (is) proper? (The prima-facie view) reached (is) — Not with a remainder as the entire Karman is enjoyed For, Anuśaya is the Karman remaining after enjoyment. And that would not be remaining, if there was the enjoyment of the entire fruit.

'यावत्संपातमुषित्वा' (छा. ५।१०।५)

इति वचनात्कृत्स्नोपभोगश्च ज्ञायते । संपतन्त्यनेन स्वर्गं लोकमिति संपातः कर्मोच्यते । श्रुत्यन्तरं च

'प्राप्यान्तं कर्मणस्तस्य यत्किंचेह करोत्ययम् ।
तस्माल्लोकात्पुनरेत्यस्मै लोकाय कर्मणे ॥' (बृ. ४।४।६)

इति ।

[384] एवं प्राप्ते, अभिधीयते—अनुशयवान्प्रत्यवरोहति, इति । कुतः ? दृष्टस्मृतिभ्याम् । श्रुतिस्मृतिभ्याम्, इत्यर्थः । श्रुतिस्तावत्

'तद्य इह रमणीयचरणा अभ्याशो ह यत्ते रमणीयां योनिमापद्येरन्ब्राह्मणयोनिं क्षत्रिययोनिं वैश्ययोनिं वा । अथ य इह कपूयचरणा अभ्याशो ह यत्ते कपूयां योनिमापद्येरञ्श्वयोनिं वा शूकरयोनिं वा चण्डालयोनिं वा' (छा. ५।१०।७)

इति प्रत्यवरूढान्प्रति श्रूयते । अमुष्माल्लोकात्प्रत्यवरूढेषु रमणीयकर्माणो रमणीयां ब्राह्मणादियोनिं प्रतिपद्यन्ते, कपूयचरणाः कुत्सितकर्माणः कुत्सितां श्वशूकरचाण्डालादियोनिं प्रतिपद्यन्ते, इति प्रत्यवरूढानां पुण्यपापकर्मभोगं दर्शयति । स्मृतिरपि

'वर्णा आश्रमाश्च स्वकर्मनिष्ठाः प्रेत्य कर्मफलमनुभूय ततः शेषेण विशिष्ट-

---

In (the pasage)

'*Having stayed there till falling down*' (Chā. 5·10·5)

the enjoyment of the entire (Karman) is spoken of. Sampāta is that by which *people fall on to the heavenly world,— spoken of as Karman*—And there is another Śruti-passage (to the same effect)—

'*Having gone to the end of that Karman,—whatever he does here,—he comes back from that world to this, world for the sake of Karman.*' (Bṛ. 4·4·6)

[384] This (prima-facie view) being reached, (this) is stated (in reply)—He descends with a remainder. Whence ? Dṛṣtasmṛtibhyām—that is to say, from the Śruti and the Śmṛti. As for the Sruti,—it is mentioned by the Sruti in respect of those who descend—

'*There, those who here possessed of good conduct, verily, descend; they would be attaining to a good womb, Brāhmaṇa-womb, Kṣatriya-womb or Vaiśya-uomb; those again who possessed of bad conduct, verily, descend; they would be attaining to a abject womb, or a dog-uomb, or a hog-womb or a Cāndāla-womb.*' (Chā. 5·10·7)

Amongst those that have come down from the other world, those who have to their credit good Karman, attain to the good Brāhmaṇa-womb etc.; those having to their credit something sinful (Kapūya), those who have done bad deeds, attain to the abject womb of a dog, of a hog or of a Cāṇḍāla. Thus, the Śruti points out to the enjoyment of holy and sinful Karmans in the case of those that have descended. The Smṛti also (points out to the same effect)—

'*The castes and the stages in life depend upon one's own Karman. Having departed thus life, having enjoyed the fruit of Karman, they, by virtue of the remainder, thereafter take to the*

देशजातिकुलरूपायुःश्रुतवित्तवृत्तसुखमेधसो जन्म प्रतिपद्यन्ते । विष्वञ्चो विपरीता नश्यन्ति' (गौत. स्मृ २।११।१२-१३)

इति । तथा

'ततः परिवृत्तौ कर्मफलशेषेण जाति रूपं वर्णं बलं मेधां प्रज्ञां द्रव्याणि धर्मानुष्ठानमिति प्रतिपद्यन्ते । तच्चक्रवदुभयोर्लोकयोः सुख एव वर्तन्ते' (आ. ध सू २।१।२-३)

इति ।

'यावत्सम्पातम्' (छा. ५।१०।५)

इति फलदानप्रवृत्तकर्मविशेषविषयम् ।

'यत्किञ्चेह करोत्ययम्' (बृ. ४।४।६)

इति, इदमपि तद्विषयमेव । अभुक्तफलानाम्, अकृतप्रायश्चित्तानां च कर्मणां कर्मान्तरफलानुभवान्नाशोऽप्यनुपपन्नः । अतोऽमुं लोकं गताः सानुशया एव यथेतमनेवं च पुनर्निवर्तन्ते । आरोहणप्रकारेण प्रकारान्तरेण च पुनर्निवर्तन्ते, इत्यर्थः । आरोहणं च धूमरात्र्यपरपक्षदक्षिणायनषण्मासपितृलोकाकाशचन्द्रक्रमेण, अवरोहणं तु चन्द्रमसः स्थानादाकाशवायुधूमाभ्रमेघक्रमेण । तत्राकाशादवरोहणाद्यथेतं वाय्वादिप्राप्तिः पितृलोकाद्यप्राप्तेश्चानेवम् ॥ ८ ॥

---

birth of one associated with a particular region, caste, family, form, life, learning, wealth, conduct, happiness, and talent Those who go the wrong way acting contrary perish' (Gauta Smr. 2·11·12-13)

Likewise,

'On returning from there, by virtue of the remainder-fruit of Karman, they take to caste, form, colour, strength, talent, intelligence, substances, and performance of religious duty. And like a wheel, in both the worlds, they live on, verily, happily' (Ā Dha. Sū. 2 1·2-3)

(The expression)

'Till falling down' (Chā 5·10 5)

refers to the particular Karman which has begun to give its fruit. (The passage)

'Whatever he does here' (Br. 4 4 6)

also refers to the same matter. And the destruction of Karmans, the fruits of which are not enjoyed, for which no atonement has been made, by the experience of the fruit of another Karman, is also inappropriate Therefore, those who have gone to the other world, come back again as they had gone but not in the same way, being, verily, with some remainder—that is to say, by the way of ascent, but they return again in another order. The ascent is in the order of—smoke, night, the dark fortnight, the six months when the Sun goes to the south, the world of Pitrs, Ākāśa and the Moon But the descent from the moon-region is in the order—Ākāsa, wind, smoke, cloud, and rain There, Yathetam—on account of Vāyu etc, being reached while descending from Ākāśa, and Anevam—Pitrloka etc., not being reached. ‖ 8 ‖

चरणादिति चेन्न तदुपलक्षणार्थेति कार्ष्णाजिनिः ॥ ९ ॥

[385] रमणीयचरणाः कपूयचरणा इति न चरणशब्देन पुण्यपापरूपं कर्माभिधीयते, चरणशब्दस्य लोकवेदयोराचारे प्रसिद्धेः। लौकिकाः खलु चरणमाचारः शीलं वृत्तम्, इति पर्यायानभिमन्यन्ते। वेदे च

'यान्यनवद्यानि कर्माणि। तानि सेवितव्यानि। नो इतराणि। यान्यस्माकं सुचरितानि। तानि त्वयोपास्यानि।' (तै. १।११।२)

इति चरणकर्मणी भेदेन व्यपदिश्येते। अतश्चरणाच्छीलात्, योनिविशेषप्राप्तिर्नानुशयादिति चेत्, तन्न। चरणश्रुतिः कर्मोपलक्षणार्था, इति हि कार्ष्णाजिनिराचार्यो मन्यते, केवलाचारात्सुखदुःखप्राप्त्यसंभवात्। सुखदुःखे हि पुण्यपापरूपकर्मफले ॥ ९ ॥

आनर्थक्यमिति चेन्न तदपेक्षत्वात् ॥ १० ॥

[386] एवं तर्ह्यफलत्वादाचारस्य स्मृतिविहितस्यानर्थक्यमेवेति चेत्–तन्न, तदपेक्षत्वात्पुण्यस्य कर्मणः। आचारवत एव पुण्यकर्मस्वधिकारः

If (it is argued that) on account of Caraṇa,—(we say) No, that is to indicate (Karman)—thus Kārṣṇājini. ॥ 9 ॥

[385] If it be argued that in the expressions Ramaṇīyacaraṇāh, Kapūyacaraṇāh — by the word Carana is not denoted Karman — merit and demerit—because the word Caraṇa is well-known in the Vedas and in the world, to mean conduct. Men of the world, indeed, regard as synonyms Caraṇa, Ācāra (conduct), Śila (character), Vṛtta (behaviour). And in the Veda—

'Whatever blameless deeds are of ours, those should be taken to (by you), not others; whatever good deeds of ours, those should be attended to by you.' (Tai. 1·11·2)

In this passage Caraṇa and Karman are mentioned separately. Therefore, from Caraṇa,—from conduct—there is the attainment to a particular womb, and not from the remainder,—if (it be argued thus)—(we reply)—Not so. The Śruti-passage referring to Caraṇa is for the sake of pointing out indeed Karman —thus opines the preceptor, Kārṣṇājini,—on account of the impossibility of securing happiness and misery, from mere conduct; for, happiness and misery are (respectively) the fruit of Karman in the form of merit and demerit. ॥ 9 ॥

If (it be argued) that uselessness (would result) — (we say) — No, on account of that being dependent upon that (conduct) ॥ 10 ॥

[386] Then in that case, the conduct prescribed by the Smṛti, would be quite useless on account of its leading to no fruit,—*if (it is argued thus)*,— (we say)—No, on account of holy Karman being dependent upon that. Only he, who has good conduct to his credit is entitled to perform meritorious deeds, on account of the statements—

'संध्याहीनोऽशुचिर्नित्यमनर्हः सर्वकर्मणि ।'　　(दक्षस्मृ. २।२७)
'आचारहीनं न पुनन्ति वेदाः ।'　　(वसिष्ठस्मृ. ६।३)
इत्यादिवचनेभ्यः । अतश्चरणश्रुतिः कर्मोपलक्षणार्थेति कार्ष्णाजिनेरभिप्रायः ॥ १० ॥

सुकृतदुष्कृते एवेति तु बादरिः ॥ ११ ॥

पुण्यं कर्माचरति पापं कर्माचरतीति कर्मणि चरतेः प्रयोगात्पृथङ्निर्देशस्य च प्रत्यक्षश्रुतिसिद्धाचारानुमितश्रुतिसिद्धविषयत्वेन गोबलीवर्दन्यायेनोपपत्तेर्मुख्ये संभवति, न लक्षणा न्याय्येति, सुकृतदुष्कृते एव चरणशब्दाभिधेये, इति बादरिराचार्यो मन्यते । अत्र बादरिमतमेव स्वमतम् । आचारानुमितश्रुतिविहितसंध्यावन्दनादेः कर्मान्तराधिकारापादनं फलमिति तु स्वीकृतम् । अतः सानुशय एव प्रत्यवरोहति ॥ ११ ॥

कृतात्ययाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (२)

अनिष्टादिकारिणामपि च श्रुतम् ॥ १२ ॥ (अधिकरण ३, सूत्राणि १२–२१)

[387] केवलेष्टापूर्तदत्तकारिणः चन्द्रमसं गत्वा सानुशया एव निवर्तन्त इत्युक्तम् । इदानीम्, अनिष्टादिकारिणोऽपि चन्द्रमसं गच्छन्ति न वेति चिन्त्यते । ये विहितं न कुर्वन्ति

'One not performing the Saṁdhyā rite, impure, is always unfit to do any Karman'　　(Dakṣa. Smṛ. 2·27)
'The Vedas do not purify one bereft of good conduct.'
(Vasiṣṭha. Smṛ. 6·3)

etc.,—Therefore, the Sruti referring to Caraṇa indicates Karman—this (is) the view of Kārṣṇājini. ‖ 10 ‖

But Bādari (says)—good and evil deeds themselves. ‖ 11 ‖

The preceptor Bādari thinks that good and bad deeds themselves are denoted by the word Caraṇa, as the metaphorical sense is improper when the primary sense is possible, on account of the root Car being used in the sense of Karman, in (statements like)— He performs holy Karman, he performs sinful Karman, and the separate mention with its object of reference established by the direct Sruti, and established by the Śruti inferred from the Acāra, being appropriate after the maxim of Gobalīvarda (cow and bull). Here, the view of Bādari alone is the (Sūtrakāra's) own view. It has indeed been accepted by us that the fruit of the twilight-worship etc., prescribed by the Śruti as inferred from the established conduct, is to ensure eligibility for other Karman. Therefore, he does descend, possessed of the remainder. ‖ 11 ‖

Here ends the Kṛtātyayādhikaraṇa (2)

Of those who perform evil deeds etc., also, it has been described by the Śruti. ‖ 12 ‖

(Adhikaraṇa 3, Sūtras 12–21)

[387] It has been stated that those who perform merely sacrificial deeds, pious deeds and give gifts, having gone to the Moon, return with the remainder itself (of Karman) to their credit Now it is considered—whether those who perform evil deeds etc., also go to the Moon or not. Those who do not do,

निषिद्धं च कुर्वन्ति त उभयेऽपि पापकर्माणोऽनिष्टादिकारिणः । किं युक्तम्? तेऽपि चन्द्रमसं गच्छन्तीति । कुतः? तेषामपि हि तद्गमनं श्रुतम्

'ये वै के चास्माल्लोकात्प्रयन्ति चन्द्रमसमेव ते सर्वे गच्छन्ति' (कौ. १।२)

इत्यविशेषेण सर्वेषामेव गतिश्रवणात् ॥ १२ ॥

एवं तर्हि सुकृतदुष्कृतकारिणोरुभयोरप्यविशिष्टैव गतिः स्यात् — नेत्याह—

संयमने त्वनुभूयेतरेषामारोहावरोहौ तद्गतिदर्शनात् ॥ १३ ॥

तुशब्दः शङ्कां व्यावर्तयति । इतरेषामनिष्टादिकारिणां चन्द्रारोहावरोहौ, संयमने यमशासने तत्प्रयुक्तयातना अनुभूयैव नान्यथा । कुतः? तद्गतिदर्शनात् । दृश्यते हि पापकर्मणां यमवश्यतया तद्गमनम्

'अयं लोको नास्ति न पर इति मानी पुनःपुनर्वशमापद्यते मे ।'
(का. २।६)

'वैवस्वतं संयमनं जनानां यम राजानम्'
(ऋ. सं. १०।१४।१; तै. आ. ६।१)

इत्यादिषु ॥ १३ ॥

स्मरन्ति च ॥ १४ ॥

---

what is prescribed, and those who do what is prohibited,—both those, verily, are performers of evil deeds etc. (Aniṣṭādikāriṇaḥ)—What (is) proper? They also go to the Moon. Whence? In their case also, going there is mentioned by the Sruti on account of the going being mentioned in the case of all without distinction, in (the passage)

Whosoever, verily, depart from this world, — they all go to the Moon alone'. (Kau. 1·2)

|| 12 ||

Well, in that case, there would be the same common course even for both performers of good deeds and performers of evil deeds!—No, (the Sūtrakāra) says—

But the ascent and descent of the others, after enjoying (the fruit of Karman) in Saṁyamana, on account of movement there being seen. || 13 ||

The word Tu (but) removes the doubt. In the case of others—those that perform evil deeds etc.,—the ascent to and descent from the Moon (take place) only after experiencing the agonies inflicted by him (Yama) in Saṁyamana ruled over by Yama; not otherwise. Whence? On account of the movement there being seen; for, in the case of the evil-doers, going there under the control of Yama is declared in—

'One who thinks this world exists not, nor the other, again and again comes under my control' (Kā. 2·6)

'To Vaivasvata, (the son of Vivasvat), the controller (Saṁyamana) of people, Yama, the king.' (Ṛg. 10·14·1; Tai Ā. 6·1)

etc. || 13 ||

And they say in the Smṛti-works. || 14 ||

स्मरन्ति च सर्वेषां यमवश्यतां पराशरादयः

'सर्वे चैते वश यान्ति यमस्य भगवन्किल ।' (वि पु ३।७।५)

इत्यादिषु ॥ १४ ॥

अपि सप्त ॥ १५ ॥

पापकर्मणां गन्तव्यत्वेन रौरवादीन्सप्त नरकानपि स्मरन्ति ॥ १५ ॥

ननु सप्तसु लोकेषु गच्छतां कथं यमसदनप्राप्तिः ? अत आह—

तत्रापि तद्व्यापारादविरोधः ॥ १६ ॥

तेष्वपि सप्तसु यमाज्ञयैव गमनादविरोधः । अतोऽनिष्टादिकारिणामपि यमलोकं प्राप्य स्वकर्मानुरूपं यातनाश्चानुभूय पश्चाच्चन्द्रारोहावरोहौ स्तः ॥ १६ ॥

[388] इति प्राप्ते, उच्यते—

विद्याकर्मणोरिति तु प्रकृतत्वात् ॥१७॥

तुशब्दः पक्षव्यावृत्त्यर्थः । अनिष्टादिकारिणामपि चन्द्रप्राप्तिरस्तीत्येतन्नोपपद्यते । कुतः । विद्याकर्मणोरिति । विद्याकर्मणो.-फलभोगार्थत्वाद्देवयानपितृयाणयोः । एतदुक्तं भवति—अनिष्टादिकारिणां यथा विद्याविधुरत्वाद्देवयानेन पथा गमनं न संभवति, तद्वदेवेष्टापूर्तदत्तविधुरत्वा-

---

And Parāśara and others in the Smrti-works speak of all being under the control of Yama

'And all these, it is reported, (O) Revered one, come under the control of Yama' (V. P. 3·7·5)

etc ॥ 14 ॥

Seven also ॥ 15 ॥

They also refer in Smrti-works to seven hells, Raurava etc., as the places where the sinners have to go ॥ 15 ॥

I say (says the objector)—How can those who move in the seven worlds (hells) be said to reach the house of Yama ?—To this (the Sūtrakāra) says—

On account of his jurisdiction there also, (there is) no contradiction ॥ 16 ॥

There is no contradiction on account of their going even to (all) those seven (hells) under the orders of Yama himself Therefore, even in the case of the evil-doers etc, ascent to and descent from the Moon are there, later, after having reached the world of Yama and after having experienced agonies befitting their Karman ॥ 16 ॥

[**388**] This (prima-facie view) being reached, it is stated (by way of reply)—

But on account of Vidyā and Karman, because of (their *being*) *the matter in hand.* ॥ 17 ॥

The word Tu is for the sake of turning away the view set forth. That even those who are evil-doers etc, reach the Moon, is not appropriate Whence? On account of Vidyā and Karman Vidyākarmanoh—Of the Devayāna and Pitryāna for the sake of enjoyment of the fruit (of knowledge and Karman respectively) This is what is intended to be said—Just as in the case of the doers of evil etc, it is not possible for them, to travel by the

त्पितृयाणेन चन्द्रगमनमपि न संभवतीति। देवयानपितृयाणयोर्विद्याविषयत्वं पुण्यकर्मविषयत्वं च कथमवगम्यते ? इति चेत्-प्रकृतत्वात्तयोः। प्रकृता हि देवयाने विद्या पितृयाणे च कर्म।

'तद्य इत्थं विदुर्ये चेमेऽरण्ये श्रद्धां तप इत्युपासते' (छा. ५।१०।१)

इत्युक्त्वा

'तेऽर्चिषमभिसंभवन्त्यर्चिषोऽहः' (छा ५।१०।१)

इत्यादिना देवयानवचनात्।

'अथ य इमे ग्राम इष्टापूर्ते दत्तमित्युपासते' (छा. ५।१०।३)

इत्युक्त्वा

'ते धूममभिसंभवन्ति' (छा. ५।१०।३)

इत्यादिना पितृयाणवचनाच्च।

'ये वै के चास्माल्लोकात्प्रयन्ति चन्द्रमसमेव ते सर्वे गच्छन्ति' (कौ. १।२)

इत्यपि वचनं य इष्टादिकारिणस्ते सर्वे इति परिणेयम्॥ १७॥

[389] ननु पापकर्मणां चन्द्रगमनाभावे पञ्चमाहुत्यसंभवाच्छरीरारम्भ एव नोपपद्यते।

Devayāna path, because they are deficient in the (necessary) knowledge (Vidyā); exactly in the same way, going to the Moon by the Pitryāna also, is not possible, because they have not to their credit sacrificial and pious deeds and charitable gifts. If (it is asked)—How is it known that the Devayāna and the Pitryāna (respectively) pertain to the Vidyā and pertain to the meritorious deeds?—(the answer is)—As those are the matter in hand For, Vidyā is the subject-matter in (the case of) the Devayāna, and Karman in (the case of) the Pitryāṇa, on account of the reference to the Devayāna in—

'*They proceed on to the flame, from the flame to the day*' (Chā. 5·10·1)

etc., after having stated

'*Then, those who know thus and those who worship in the forest Śraddhā and penance*' (Chā. 5·10·1)

—And on account of the reference to the Pitṛyāṇa in

'*They proceed on to the smoke*' (Chā. 5·10·3)

etc, after having stated—

'*Now, those who worship (practise) in the village sacrificial and pious deeds and give gifts.*' (Chā. 5·10·3)

'*Those, verily, whosoever depart from this world — they all go to the Moon alone*' (Kau. 1·2)

—This statement also is to be construed as (to mean) those all i. e. those who perform sacrificial deeds etc ‖ 17 ‖

[389] I say (says the objector)—In the absence of evil-doers going to the Moon, there would not be the production of the body itself, on account of the absence of the fifth offering; for, in (the passage)

'*पञ्चम्यामाहुतावापः पुरुषवचसो भवन्ति*' (छा. ५।९।१)

इति हि शरीरारम्भः श्रूयते। सा चाहुतिश्चन्द्रप्राप्तिपूर्विकेति दर्शितम्। अतः शरीरारम्भायैव तेषामपि चन्द्रारोहावरोहाववश्याभ्युपेत्यौ, इत्यत आह—

न तृतीये तथोपलब्धेः ॥ १८ ॥

तृतीयस्थानस्य शरीरारम्भाय न पञ्चमाहुत्यपेक्षा। कुतः? तथोपलब्धेः। तृतीयस्थानशब्देन केवलपापकर्माण उच्यन्ते। तेषां देहारम्भे पञ्चमाहुत्यनपेक्षत्वमुपलभ्यते।

'*वेत्थ यथा फेनासौ लोको न सपूर्यते*' (छा. ५।३।३)

इत्यस्य प्रश्नस्य प्रतिवचने

'*अथैतयोः पथोर्न कतरेण च तानीमानि क्षुद्राण्यसकृदावर्तीनि भूतानि भवन्ति जायस्व म्रियस्वेत्येतत्तृतीयं स्थानं तेनासौ लोको न संपूर्यते*' (छा. ५।१०।८)

इति तृतीयस्थानस्य द्युलोकारोहावरोहाभावेन द्युलोकासंपूर्तिवचनादस्य तृतीयस्थानस्य शरीरारम्भाय न पञ्चमाहुत्यपेक्षा। पञ्चम्यामाहुताविति चापां पञ्चमाग्निसंबन्धस्य पुरुषवचस्त्वहेतुत्वमात्रं प्रतिपादयति नान्यन्निवारयति, अवधारणाश्रवणात् ॥ १८ ॥

'*In the fifth libat on, the waters come to be called a human being.*' (Chā. 5·9·1)

is mentioned by the Sruti the production of the body, and that oblation has been shown to be preceded by going to the Moon. Therefore, for the production itself of the body, ascent to and descent from the Moon must be surely admitted in their case also. To this (the Sūtrakāra) says (in reply)—

Not in the case of the third, on account of the actual perception accordingly. ॥ 18 ॥

In the case of the third place, there is no need of the fifth oblation for the production of the body. Whence? Tathopalabdheh—(As that is actually perceived). By the word · Trtiyasthāna are spoken of those that do only sinful deeds. In their case is seen the absence of any need for the fifth offering, for the purpose of producing the body.

'*Do you know how and why is not that world all filled?*'— (Chā. 5·3·3)

—in reply to this question, the answer (is)

'*Not by either of these two paths; those become these insignificant creatures repeatedly revolving (taking on existence) — are born, die (in this manner) — this (is) the third place. Therefore, that world is not all filled—*' (Chā. 5·10·8)

Therefore, because, in the case of the third place, there is the statement about the non-filling of the heavenly world on account of the absence of the ascent to and descent from the heavenly world, there is no need for the fifth offering for the production of the body in the case of the third place. The expression—In the fifth offering—propounds that the connection of waters with the fifth fire is merely the cause of the designation Puruṣa, but does not ward off anything else, on account of the non-mention of any emphasising factor. ॥ 18 ॥

स्मर्यतेपि च लोके ॥ १९ ॥

पुण्यकर्मणामपि केषांचित्पञ्चमाहुत्यनपेक्षया देहारम्भो लोके स्मर्यते द्रौपदीधृष्टद्युम्नप्रभृतीनाम् ॥ १९ ॥

दर्शनाच्च ॥ २० ॥

श्रुतावपि दृश्यते केषांचित्पञ्चमाहुत्यनपेक्षया देहारम्भः

'तेषां खल्वेषां भूतानां त्रीण्येव बीजानि भवन्ति । अण्डजं जीवजमुद्भिज्जम्'

(छा. ६।३।१)

इति । तेषूद्भिजस्वेदजयोर्भूतयोः पञ्चमाहुतिमन्तरेणोत्पत्तिर्दृश्यते ॥ २० ॥

ननु न स्वेदजानामत्र संकीर्तनमस्ति त्रीण्येव बीजानीति वचनात् । तत्राह—

तृतीयशब्दावरोधः संशोकजस्य ॥ २१ ॥

संशोकजस्य—स्वेदजस्य, अपि

'अण्डजं जीवजमुद्भिज्जम्' (छा. ६।३।१)

इत्यत्र तृतीयेनोद्भिज्जशब्देनावरोधः संग्रहो विद्यत इत्यर्थः । अतः केवलपापकर्मणां चन्द्रप्राप्तिर्न संभवति ॥ २१ ॥

आनिष्टादिकार्यधिकरणं समाप्तम् (३)

And in the world also, (so) is stated in the Smṛti ॥ 19 ॥

In the case of some doers of meritorious deeds also, such as Draupadī Dhṛṣṭadyumna etc., is mentioned in the Smṛti, the production of the body in the world without the need of the fifth offering. ॥ 19 ॥

And on account of this being seen (in the Śruti) ॥ 20 ॥

In the Śruti also is seen the production of the body in the case of some, without any need for the fifth offering—

'Of those, indeed, of these beings, there are three seeds only —born of the egg, born of the living Jīva, born of the earth.'

(Chā. 6·3·1)

Out of them, is seen the production without the fifth offering, of beings—born of the earth and born of perspiration ॥ 20 ॥

I say (says the objector)—There is no mention here of those born of perspiration on account of the statement—Three seeds only. There (the Sūtrakāra) says—

The inclusion, by the third word, of that born of perspiration. ॥ 21 ॥

In (the passage)

'Born of the egg, born of the living Jīva, born of the earth,'

(Chā 6·3·1)

—here by the third word Udbhijja there is seen the Avarodha—inclusion of that born of the heat—born of perspiration, also—This (is) the sense Therefore, in the case of the sinners only, there is not possible going over to the Moon. ॥ 21 ॥

Here ends the Aniṣṭādikāryadhikaraṇa (3)

तत्स्वाभाव्यापत्तिरुपपत्तेः ॥ २२ ॥

(अधिकरण ४, सू २२)

[390] इष्टादिकारिणो भूतसूक्ष्मसंपरिष्वक्ताः सानुशयाश्चन्द्रमसमारोहन्तीत्युक्तम्। अवरोहप्रकारश्च

'अथैतमेवाध्वानं पुनर्निवर्तन्ते । यथेतमाकाशम् । आकाशाद्वायुम् । वायुर्भूत्वा धूमो भवति । धूमो भूत्वाभ्रं भवति । अभ्रं भूत्वा मेघो भवति । मेघो भूत्वा प्रवर्षति '

(छा. ५।१०।५-६)

इति वचनात्, यथेतमनेवं चेत्युक्तम्। तत्र, अस्याकाशादिप्रतिपत्तौ देवमनुष्यादिभाववदाकाशादिभावः, उत तत्साद्दश्यापत्तिमात्रम्, इति विषये, श्रद्धावस्थस्य सोमभाववदविशेषादाकाशादिभावः, इति प्राप्ते, तत्स्वाभाव्यापत्तिरेवेत्युच्यते। तत्स्वाभाव्यापत्तिः, तत्साद्दश्यापत्तिरित्यर्थः। कुत एतत् ? उपपत्तेः । सोमभावमनुष्यभावादौ हि सुखदुःखोपभोगाय तद्भावः । अत्र त्वाकाशादौ सुखदुःखोपभोगाभावात्तद्भावानुपपत्तेस्तद्भापत्तिवचनं तत्संसर्गकृतं तत्साद्दश्यापत्त्यभिप्रायम् ॥ २२ ॥

तत्स्वाभाव्यापत्त्यधिकरणं समाप्तम् (४)

Attaining to similarity with that on account of propriety ॥ 22 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 4, Sūtra 22)

[390] It has been stated that those who perform sacrificial rites etc., ascend up to the Moon, enveloped by the subtle elements and with the residue (of Karman). As to the mode of descent, on the authority (of the Sruti)—

'Now, to this very path they return again, as they had gone, to Ākāsa; from Ākāśa to Vāyu; having become Vāyu, he becomes smoke; having become smoke, he becomes the cloud; having become the cloud, he becomes a water-giving cloud; having become a water-giving cloud, he showers forth rain.' (Chā. 5·10·5-6)

—it is stated that as he had gone, but not in the same way. There, there being a doubt,—Is there in his case possession of the nature of Akāśa etc., like the nature of god, man, etc., when he becomes identified with Akāśa etc., or, is there, merely attaining to similarity with them ?—(the prima-facie view) — the possession of the nature of Ākāśa etc., on account of no distinction there, like (the possession of) the nature of Soma etc., by one in the state of being Śraddhā—(this) being reached, it is stated that—(there is) only attainment to the similarity with that. Tatsvābhāvyāpati means attainment to the similarity with them. Whence this ? On account of propriety ; for, in respect of the possession of the nature of Soma, the nature of man, etc , there is indeed the nature of them for the purpose of the enjoyment of happiness and misery ; but here in respect of Ākāśa etc , there is the impropriety about the possession of their nature, on account of the absence of the enjoyment of happiness and misery. And so, the statement about becoming that has the sense of attaining to similarity with them due to their contact. ॥ 22 ॥

Here ends the Tatsvābhāvyāpattyadhikaraṇa (4)

नातिचिरेण विशेषात् ॥ २३ ॥

(अधिकरण ५, सू. २३)

[391] आकाशप्राप्तिप्रभृति यावद्व्रीह्यादिप्राप्ति किं तत्र तत्र नातिचिरं तिष्ठति, उत, अनियमः ? इति विशये, नियमहेत्वभावादनियमः, इति प्राप्ते, उच्यते—नातिचिरेण, इति । कुतः ? विशेषात् । उत्तरत्र व्रीह्यादिप्राप्तौ

'अतो वै खलु दुर्निष्प्रपतरम्' (छा. ५।१०।६)

इति विशिष्य कृच्छ्रनिष्क्रमणत्वाभिधानात्पूर्वत्र ह्याकाशादिप्राप्तावचिरं निष्क्रमणं गम्यते । दुर्निष्प्रपतरमिति छान्दसस्तशब्दलोपः । दुर्निष्प्रपततरं दुःखनिष्क्रमणमित्यर्थः ॥ २३ ॥

नातिचिराधिकरणं समाप्तम् (५)

अन्याधिष्ठिते पूर्ववदभिलापात् ॥ २४ ॥

(अधिकरण ६, सूत्राणि २४–२७)

[392] अवरोहन्तो जीवा व्रीह्यादिभावेन जायन्ते, इति श्रूयते

'मेघो भूत्वा प्रवर्षति । त इह व्रीहियवा ओषधिवनस्पतयस्तिलमाषा जायन्ते'

(छा. ५।१०।६)

Not for very long, on account of the speciality ॥ 23 ॥

(Adhikarana 5, Sūtra 23)

[391] Beginning with the attainment to Ākāśa up to the attainment to rice etc.,—(during this period)—Does he stay on there at the various places not for a very long time, or is there no rule about it ?—such a doubt being raised, (the prima-facie view) being reached viz.—No such rule on account of the absence of any cause for such a rule — it is stated (in reply) — Nāticirena—not for very long. Whence ? On account of the speciality. Further, on attaining to (the nature of) rice etc., there is the special mention about his getting out with difficulty in (the passage)

'Henceforward, verily, indeed, there is all the greater difficulty of getting out.' (Chā. 5·10·6)

—and so, it is apprehended that on attaining to Ākāśa etc., before there is the getting out in a short time There is the Vedic elision of the word Ta in Durnisprapataram. *Durnisprapatataram*—getting out with greater difficulty —This (is) the sense. ॥ 23 ॥

Here ends the Nāticirādhikarana (5)

(Contact with) supervised over (or occupied) by another, on account of the mention as before. ॥ 24 ॥

(Adhikarana 6, Sūtras 24-27)

[392] This is mentioned in the Śruti that the descending Jīvas are born in the form of rice etc.—

'Having become a rain-cloud he showers They are born here as rice, wheat, herbs, plants, sesamum and beans.'

(Chā. 5·10·6)

इति । ते किमन्यैर्भोक्तृभिर्व्रीह्यादिशरीरैरधिष्ठितान्व्रीह्यादीनाश्लिष्यन्ति, उत ते भोक्तारो व्रीह्यादिशरीरा जायन्ते ? इति विशये, जायन्त इति वचनात्, देवो जायते, मनुष्यो जायते, इतिवद्व्रीह्यादिशरीरा एवेति प्राप्ते, उच्यते—अन्याधिष्ठिते, इति । जीवान्तरेणाधिष्ठिते व्रीह्यादिशरीरे तेषां संश्लेषमात्रमेव । कुतः ? पूर्ववदभिलापात् । आकाशादिमेघपर्यन्तवत्केवलतत्तद्भावाभिलापात् । यत्र हि भोक्तृत्वमभिप्रेतं तत्र तत्साधनभूतं कर्माभिलप्यते

'*रमणीयचरणाः कपूयचरणाः*' (छा. ५।१०।७)

इति । इह चाकाशादिवन्नाभिलप्यते कर्म, फलदाने प्रवृत्तस्य स्वर्गोपभोग्यफलस्येष्टादेः कर्मणः स्वर्गभोगादेव समाप्तत्वात्, अनारब्धस्य च

'*रमणीयचरणाः कपूयचरणाः*' (छा. ५।१०।७)

इति वक्ष्यमाणत्वात्, मध्ये कर्मान्तराभावाच्च । अत आकाशादिभाववचनवद्व्रीह्यादिभावेन जन्मवचनमौपचारिकम् ॥ २४ ॥

अशुद्धमिति चेन्न शब्दात् ॥ २५ ॥

[393] नैतदस्ति यदन्याधिष्ठिते व्रीह्यादिशरीरे संश्लेषमात्रम्, भोक्तृत्वहेत्वभावात्

Now a doubt being raised—Do they stick on to rice etc., supervised over by other enjoyers with rice etc., as their bodies; or are they born as enjoyers with rice etc., as their bodies ?—and (the prima-facie view) being reached viz.—On the strength of the expression—Are born—they are, verily, possessed of rice etc, as their bodies (as warranted by the expressions) like—A god is born.—A man is born,—It is stated (in reply)—supervised over by another. There is a mere contact of theirs, with the body, rice etc., supervised over by another Jīva. Whence ? Pūrvavadabhilāpāt — on account of the mention of merely the various natures like that, beginning with the sky and ending with the cloud. For, where the idea is that of being the enjoyer, there is mentioned the Karman which is the means thereof, as in (the passage)

'*Those possessed of good conduct, those possessed of sinful conduct.*' (Chā. 5 10·7)

Here is not mentioned the Karman as in the case of Ākāśa etc., on account of the Karman,—sacrificial etc., which has the fruit to be enjoyed in heaven, which has (actually) started giving its fruit, being finished owing to the enjoyment of heaven itself, because (the Karman) which has not yet begun (to give its fruit) is being mentioned later in (the passage)

'*Those possessed of good conduct, those possessed of sinful conduct*' (Chā. 5·10·7)

and because there is no other Karman in the middle (intervening period). Therefore, like the statement about the nature of Ākāśa etc., the statement about being born in the state of rice etc., is metaphorical ॥ 24 ॥

If (it be said) that, impure, (we say) — No, on account of the word. ॥ 25 ॥

[393] It cannot be said that there is mere contact with the rice-

व्रीह्यादिभावेन जन्मेति, भोक्तृत्वहेतुसद्भावात् । स्वर्गोपभोग्यफलमिष्टादिकर्मैवाशुद्धं पापमिश्रम्, अग्नीषोमीयादिहिंसायुक्तत्वात् । हिंसा च

'न हिंस्यात्सर्वभूतानि' (म. भा. शा. २७८।५)

इति निषिद्धत्वात्पापमेव। न चात्र पदाहवनीयादिवदुत्सर्गापवादः संभवति, भिन्नविषयत्वात् । अग्नीषोमीयादिहिंसाविधिहिंसाया क्रतूपकारकत्वं बोधयति । न हिंस्यात्, इति तु हिंसायाः प्रत्यवायफलत्वम् ।

अथोच्येत–अग्नीषोमीयादिषु विधितः प्रवृत्तेर्न तद्विषयं निषेधविधिरास्कन्दति, रागप्राप्तविषयत्वात्तस्येति । नैवम्, इहापि रागप्राप्तेरविशिष्टत्वात् ।

'स्वर्गकामो यजेत' (तै. सं. २।५।५)

इत्येवमादौ हि कामिनः कर्तव्यतया यागाद्युपदेशाद्यागादेः स्वर्गादिसाधनत्वमवगम्य, फलरागत एव यागादौ प्रवर्तते । अग्नीषोमीयादिष्वपि तेषां फलसाधनभूतस्य यागादेरुपकारकत्वं शास्त्रादवगम्य रागादेव प्रवर्तते। लौकिक्यामपि हिंसायां केनचित्प्रमाणेन हिंसायाः स्वसमीहित-

---

body etc., occupied by another; and on account of the absence of any reason for being the enjoyer, no birth in the rice-state etc., because there exists a reason for being the enjoyer. The Karman—sacrificial rite, etc., with its fruits to be enjoyed in heaven, is itself impure being mixed with demerit on account of the sacrifices Agnīṣomīya etc., being associated with killing; and killing being prohibited as in (the passage)

'One should not kill any being'. (M. Bh. Śā. 278·5)

is nothing but sin. Nor again is here possible any exception to the rule, like the Padāhavanīya etc., on account of their referring to different things. The injunction about killing in Agnīṣomīya etc., points out to the killing being an obliging factor for the sacrifice. (The passage) One should not kill, on the other hand, aims at the result viz., the prohibition of the killing.

If it were said—In the case of activity due to the injunction in (sacrifices) Agnīsomīya etc, the prohibition—injunction cannot be a hindrance referring to the same, on account of that referring to something which is due to passion.—(We reply)—Not so. Here also, something due to passion is common. For, in

'One desirous of heaven should sacrifice'. (Tai. Saṁ. 2·5·5)

etc., on account of the instruction about sacrifice etc., as being fit to be performed by one possessed of the desire, one proceeds to perform the sacrifice etc., throught keenness for the fruit itself, on having understood the sacrifice etc., as the means for heaven etc. In the case of the Agnīṣomīya etc., also, one proceeds through passion alone, after having understood from the Śāstra that sacrifices etc, that are the means for the fruit thereof, are an obliging factor. In the case of the non-religious (secular killing also, one does proceed through passion, after having understood by some means of proof or other that killing is the means for securing one's own desired object—so there is no

साधनत्वमवगम्य रागात्प्रवर्तते, इति न कश्चन विशेषः। तथा नित्येष्वपि कर्मसु

'सर्ववर्णाना स्वधर्मानुष्ठाने परमपरिमित सुखम्' (आ ध सू २।१।२।२)

इत्यादिवचनात्फलसाधनत्वमवगम्य रागादेव प्रवृत्तिरिति तेषामप्यशुद्धियुक्तत्वम्। अत इष्टादीनां पापमिश्रत्वेनाशुद्धियुक्तानां स्वर्गेऽनुभाव्यं फलं स्वर्गेऽनुभूय हिंसांशस्य फलं व्रीह्यादिस्थावरभावेनानुभूयते। स्थावरभावं च पापफलं स्मरन्ति

'शरीरजैः कर्मदोषैर्याति स्थावरता नरः।' (मनु १२।९)

इति। अतो व्रीह्यादिभावेन भोगायानुशयिनो जायन्त इति चेत्—तन्न। कुतः? शब्दात्। अग्नीषोमीयादेः संज्ञपनस्य स्वर्गलोकप्राप्तिहेतुतया हिंसात्वाभावशब्दात्। पशोर्हि संज्ञपननिमित्तां स्वर्गलोकप्राप्तिं वदन्तं शब्दमामनन्ति—हिरण्यशरीर ऊर्ध्वस्वर्गं लोकमेति—इत्यादिकम्। अतिशयिताभ्युदयसाधनभूतो व्यापारोऽल्पदुःखोऽपि न हिंसा, प्रत्युत रक्षणमेव।

तथा च मन्त्रवर्णः

'न वा उ वेतन्म्रियसे न रिष्यसि देवानिदेषि पथिभिः सुगेभिः।
यत्र यन्ति सुकृतो नापि दुष्कृतस्तत्र त्वा देवः सविता दधातु॥'
(तै ब्रा ३।७।७।१४)

---

distinction whatever (between the two cases) Likewise in the case of the daily duties also, having understood from the statement in

'There is the highest unlimited happiness for all Varnas in the performance of their religious duties'. (Ā Dha. Sū 2 1 2 2)

etc, that they are the means for securing the fruit there is the activity through passion itself—and so, they also are associated with impurity. Therefore because the sacrificial performances etc, are associated with impurity, being mixed with sin the fruit to be experienced in heaven having been enjoyed in heaven the fruit of the killing-part is experienced in the form of inanimate entities, rice etc In the Smrti they also say that the inanimate state is the fruit of sin—

'A man goes to the inanimate state by the blemishes in his Karman, produced from the body' (Manu 12 9)

Therefore if it is said that those possessed of the residue are born for enjoyment as rice etc —(we reply)—Not so Whence? Sabdāt—On account of the word—In the case of Agnisomiya and other sacrifices there is the word referring to the absence of the nature of killing as the cause of the attainment to heaven in respect of the killing (of the victim) For, they mention in the Scriptures the word describing the attainment to heaven due to the killing of the victim—Golden-bodied, he (the victim) goes high up to the heaven—etc The operation which is the means of excessive prosperity, though involving a little injury, is not killing, but it is verily, protection

To the same effect (is) the Mantra-passage—

'Not, verily, indeed, you die here you are not injured, you are indeed going to the gods by paths of easy movements where go

इति । चिकित्सकं च तादात्विकाल्पदुःखकारिणमपि रक्षकमेव वदन्ति पूजयन्ति च तज्ज्ञाः ॥२५॥

रेतःसिग्योगोथ ॥ २६ ॥

इतश्चौपचारिकं व्रीह्यादिजन्मवचनम् । व्रीह्यादिभाववचनानन्तरम्

'यो यो ह्यन्नमत्ति यो यो रेतः सिञ्चति तद्भूय एव भवति' (छा ५।१०।६)

इति रेतःसिग्योगोऽनुशयिनां श्रूयमाणो यथा तद्भावमात्रं प्रतिपादयति तद्वद्व्रीह्यादिभावोऽपीत्यर्थः ॥ २६ ॥

योनेः शरीरम् ॥ २७ ॥

योनिप्राप्तेः पश्चादेवानुशयिनां शरीरप्राप्तिः, तत्रैव सुखदुःखोपभोगसद्भावात् । ततः प्रागाकाशादिप्राप्तिप्रभृति तत्तद्योगमात्रमेवेत्यर्थः ॥ २७ ॥

अन्याधिष्ठिताधिकरणं समाप्तम् (६)

इति श्रीभगवद्रामानुजविरचिते शारीरकमीमांसाभाष्ये तृतीयाध्यायस्य प्रथमः पादः ॥

---

the performers of meritorious deeds and not, indeed, the evil-doers —there let the shining Savitr (Sun) lead you on.'

(Tai. Brā. 3·7·7·14)

And people who know, speak of and also venerate a doctor although causing a temporary slight pain, as a saviour. ॥ 25 ॥

Then the process of the semen sprinkled. ॥ 26 ॥

For this reason again, the statement about birth as rice etc., is metaphorical After the statement about being the rice etc , just as the process of sprinkling the semen etc , in (the passage)

'Whosoever eats food, whosoever sprinkles the semen, that again rises up' (Chā. 5·10·6)

being spoken of in the case of those possessing the residue, explains merely having the nature of that, likewise is being rice etc , also—This (is) the sense. ॥ 26 ॥

From the Womb, (there is) the body. ॥ 27 ॥

Only after reaching the womb, there is the attainment of the body by those with the residue (of Karman), on account of the existence of the enjoyment of happiness, misery etc , there itself Therefore, prior to it, attaining to Ākāśa etc., is merely the contact with those various entities—This (is) the sense. ॥ 27 ॥

Here ends the Anyādhisthitādhikarana (6)

Here ends the First Quarter of the Third Chapter in the Commentary on the Śārīraka-mīmāmsā composed by the Illustrious Revered Rāmānuja.

तृतीयाध्यायस्य द्वितीयः पादः ।

संध्ये सृष्टिराह हि ॥ १ ॥

(अधिकरण १, सूत्राणि १–६)

[394] एवं कर्मानुरूपगमनागमनजन्मादियोगेन जाग्रतो जीवस्य दुःखित्वं स्थापितम् । इदानीमस्य स्वप्नावस्था परीक्ष्यते । स्वप्नमधिकृत्य श्रूयते—

'न तत्र रथा न रथयोगा न पन्थानो भवन्त्यथ रथान्रथयोगान्पथः सृजते । न तत्रानन्दा मुदः प्रमुदो भवन्त्यथानन्दान्मुदः प्रमुदः सृजते । न तत्र वेशान्ताः पुष्करिण्यः स्रवन्त्यो भवन्त्यथ वेशान्तान्पुष्करिणीः स्रवन्तीः सृजते । स हि कर्ता'

(बृ ४।३।१०)

इति । तत्र संशयः—किमियं रथादिसृष्टिर्जीवेनैव क्रियते, आहोस्विदीश्वरेण ? इति । किं युक्तम् ? संध्ये सृष्टिः, जीवेनेति । कुतः ? संध्यं स्वप्नस्थानमुच्यते, संध्यं तृतीयं स्वप्नस्थानमिति वचनात् । सा तु जीवेनैव क्रियते ।

'सृजते स हि कर्ता' (बृ. ४।३।१०)

इत्याह हि । स्वप्नदृग्जीव एव तत्र प्रतीयते ॥ १ ॥

निर्मातारं चैके पुत्रादयश्च ॥ २ ॥

किं चैनं जीवं स्वप्ने कामानां निर्मातारमेके शाखिनोऽधीयते

Second Quarter of the Third Chapter

Creation in the dream, for (the Śruti) says ॥ 1 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 1, Sūtras 1–6)

[394] Thus has been established the waking Jīva being in a state of misery on account of his association with going and coming, birth etc., in conformity with his Karman. Now his dream-state is examined. Referring to the dream, in the Śruti it is stated—

'Not there are chariots, nor chariot-horses, nor paths;—but he creates chariots, chariot-horses, paths; not there are delights, joys, excessive joys;—but he creates delights, joys, excessive joys; not there are mansions, (lotus-) tanks, rivers,—but he creates mansions, (lotus-) tanks, rivers. For, he (is) the doer'. (Br. 4·3·10)

—There (arises) the doubt—Is this creation of chariots etc., effected by Jīva himself or by Īśvara?—What (is) proper? The creation in the dream, by the Jīva. Whence? Sandhyam is called the dream-place, on account of the statement about Sandhya being the third, dream-place; and that (creation) is, however, effected by Jīva himself; for (the Śruti) does say

'... creates, for he (is) the doer' (Br. 4·3·10)

—There is apprehended the dream-seeing Jīva himself. ॥ 1 ॥

And some (speak of Jīva as the) creator, and the sons etc. ॥ 2 ॥

And further, the followers of some recension read this Jīva to be the creator of desired objects in dream,

'य एषु सुप्तेषु जागर्ति कामं कामं पुरुषो निर्मिमाणः' (का. ५।८)

इति। पुत्रादयश्च तत्र काम्यमानतया कामशब्देन निर्दिश्यन्ते, नेच्छामात्रम्। पूर्वत्र हि

'सर्वान्कामांश्छन्दतः प्रार्थयस्व' (का. १।२५)

'शतायुषः पुत्रपौत्रान्वृणीष्व' (का. १।२३)

इति पुत्रादय एव कामाः प्रकृताः। अतो रथादीञ्जीवः स्वप्ने सृजति। जीवस्य च सत्यसंकल्पत्वं प्रजापतिवाक्ये श्रुतम्। अत उपकरणाद्यभावेऽपि सृष्टिरुपपद्यते ॥ २ ॥

[395] इति प्राप्ते, अभिधीयते—

मायामात्रं तु कार्त्स्न्येनानभिव्यक्तस्वरूपत्वात् ॥ ३ ॥

तुशब्दः पक्षं व्यावर्तयति। स्वप्ने रथपुष्करिण्याद्यर्थजातं मायामात्रं—परमपुरुषसृष्टमित्यर्थः। मायाशब्दो ह्याश्चर्यवाची

'जनकस्य कुले जाता देवमायेव निर्मिता' (रा. बा. १।२७)

इत्यादिषु तथा दर्शनात्। अत्रापि, न तत्र रथा न रथयोगा न पन्थानः—सकलेतरपुरुषानुभाव्यतया न भवन्तीत्यर्थः। अथ रथान्रथयोगान्पथः सृजते—स्वप्नदृगनुभाव्यतया तत्कालमात्रावसानान्सृजत इत्याश्चर्यरूपत्वमेवाह। एवंविधाश्चर्यरूपा सृष्टिः सत्यसंकल्पस्य परमपुरुषस्यै-

---

'*He who keeps awake, when these are asleep, the Purusa creating the various desired objects.*' (Kā. 5·8)

And there sons etc., are pointed out by the word Kāma, because they are fit to be desired, not merely the desire. For earlier, in (passages)—

'*Pray for all desires at will*' (Kā. 1·25)

'*Choose sons and grandsons, living for a hundred years*' (Kā. 1·23)

sons etc., themselves—the desires,—are the matter in hand. Therefore, the Jīva creates chariots etc., in dream. And that the Jīva has his thoughts fulfilled, *is mentioned in the utterance of Prajāpati.* Therefore, even in the absence of means etc., creation is possible. ॥ 2 ॥

[395] This (prima-facie view) being reached, it is stated (in reply)—

But only wonder, on account of its nature not being manifest in entirety ॥ 3 ॥

The word Tu turns away the (above) view. The aggregate of objects, chariots, (lotus-) tanks etc., in dream is mere Māyā (wonder)—created by the highest Purusa.—This (is) the sense. For, the word Māyā denotes wonder on account of that (meaning) being seen in (the passage)

'*Born in the family of Janaka, created as the wonderful creation of the gods*' (Rā. Bā 1·27)

Here also in—not there chariots, nor chariot-horses, nor paths—the sense is—these do not exist as being fit to be experienced by any other person. Now, he creates chariots, chariot-horses, paths—he creates (them) existing only for the time being, as fit to be experienced by the dream-seer—thus (the Sruti) speaks of the wonderful nature itself. Such a wonderful creation is appropriate in the case of the highest Puruṣa alone who has his thoughts

वोपपद्यते न जीवस्य । तस्य सत्यसंकल्पत्वादियुक्तस्यापि संसारदशायां कात्स्न्र्येनानभिव्यक्तस्वरूपत्वान्न जीवस्य तथाविधाश्चर्यसृष्टिरुपपद्यते ।

'कामं कामं पुरुषो निर्मिमाणः'　　　　(का. ५।८)

इति च परमपुरुषमेव निर्मातारमाह

'य एषु सुप्तेषु जागर्ति'　　　　(का. ५।८)

'तदेव शुक्रं तद्ब्रह्म तदेवामृतमुच्यते ।
तस्मिँल्लोकाः श्रिताः सर्वे तदु नात्येति कश्चन ॥'　　　　(का. ५।८)

इत्युपक्रमोपसंहारयोः परमपुरुषासाधारणस्वभावप्रतीतेः ।

'अथ वेशान्तान्पुष्करिणीः स्रवन्तीः सृजते । स हि कर्ता'　　(बृ. ४।३।१०)

इति च तया श्रुत्यैकार्थ्यात्परमपुरुषमेव कर्तारमाह ॥ ३ ॥

[396] स्वाभाविकं चेज्जीवस्यापहतपाप्मत्वादिकम्, कुतस्तन्नाभिव्यज्यते ? इत्यत आह—

पराभिध्यानात्तु तिरोहितं ततो ह्यस्य बन्धविपर्ययौ ॥ ४ ॥

तुशब्दः शङ्काव्यावृत्त्यर्थः । पराभिध्यानात्— परमपुरुषसंकल्पात्, अस्य जीवस्य स्वाभाविकं रूपं तिरोहितम् । अनादिकर्मपरम्परया कृतापराधस्य ह्यस्य स्वाभाविकं कल्याणरूपं परमपुरुषस्तिरोधापयति । ततस्तत्संकल्पादेव ह्यस्य जीवस्य बन्धमोक्षौ श्रुतौ

---

fulfilled, not in the case of Jīva; because although Jīva is endowed with the nature of having his thoughts fulfilled etc., his own nature is not manifested in its entirety in the worldly state, that kind of wonderful creation is not possible in the case of Jīva. And in (the passage)

'Puruṣa creating the various desired objects'　　(Kā. 5·8)

(the writer) speaks of the highest Puruṣa alone as the creator, on account of the apprehension of the unique nature of the highest Puruṣa in the introductory and the concluding parts, in

'Who keeps awake when these are asleep'　　(Kā. 5·8)

'That alone is refulgent, that Brahman; that alone is called immortal; therein all worlds abide; no one, verily, transcends it.'　　(Kā. 5·8)

And he speaks of the highest Puruṣa alone as the creator in

'Then he creates mansions, lotus-tanks, rivers; for he (is) the doer'　　(Br. 4·3·10)

on account of this Śruti having the same sense as that. ॥ 3 ॥

[396] If, having all sins destroyed etc., is natural with the Jīva, why is it not manifested? — (If it is objected to) thus, (the Sūtrakāra) says—

But on account of the thought of the Highest, is concealed; for, from that, bondage and its opposite are his (of the Jīva) ॥ 4 ॥

The word Tu is for removing the doubt. Parābhidhyānāt — on account of the thought of the highest Puruṣa — the natural form of this Jīva is concealed; for, the highest Puruṣa conceals the natural auspicious form for him who has committed faults due to the series of beginningless Karman. Therefore, from His wish alone, the bondage and salvation of this Jīva, indeed, are mentioned in the Śruti —

'यदा ह्येवैष एतस्मिन्नदृश्येऽनात्म्येऽनिरुक्तेऽनिलयनेऽभयं प्रतिष्ठां विन्दते। अथ सोऽभयं गतो भवति। यदा ह्येवैष एतस्मिन्नुदरमन्तरं कुरुते। अथ तस्य भयं भवति।' (तै. २।७।१)

'एष ह्येवानन्दयाति' (तै. २।७।१)

'भीषास्माद्वातः पवते' (तै. २।८।१)

इत्यादिषु ॥ ४ ॥

देहयोगाद्वा सोऽपि ॥ ५ ॥

सोऽपि—तिरोभावोऽपि देहयोगद्वारेण वा भवति, सूक्ष्माचिच्छक्तियोगद्वारेण वा। सृष्टिकाले देहावस्थेनाचिद्वस्तुना संयोगाद्भवति, प्रलयकाले नामरूपविभागानर्हातिसूक्ष्माचिद्वस्तुयोगात्। अतोऽनभिव्यक्तस्वरूपत्वात्स्वप्ने जीवो न रथादीन्संकल्पमात्रेण स्रष्टुं शक्नोति।

'तस्मिँल्लोकाः श्रिताः सर्वे तदु नात्येति कश्चन।' (का. ५।८)

इति सर्वेषु सुप्तेषु जागरणं सर्वलोकाश्रयत्वमित्यादयो हि परमपुरुषस्यैव संभवन्ति। अतो जीवानामल्पाल्पकर्मानुगुणफलानुभवार्थं तावन्मात्रकालावसानांस्तदेकानुभाव्यानर्थानुत्पादयति ॥ ५ ॥

सूचकश्च हि श्रुतेराचक्षते च तद्विदः ॥ ६ ॥

'When, verily, this one attains to freedom from fear, stability in this imperceptible, non-Ātman, underived, abode-less, then he goes to fearlessness; when, verily, he makes a dent within this one, then exists fear for him.' (Tai. 2·7·1)

'This one, verily, causes delight' (Tai. 2·7·1)

'Through fear from him, the wind blows on' (Tai. 2·8·1)

etc. ॥ 4 ॥

Or, on account of the association with the body, that also. ॥ 5 ॥

That also — the concealment also — happens either through the association with the body, or through the association with the subtle non--sentient power — At the time of creation (tirobhāva) exists on account of its association with the non-sentient entity, in the body-condition; and at the time of dissolution, (tirobhāva) on account of the association with the extremely subtle non sentient entity incapable of being divided into name and form. *Therefore, on account of his nature not being manifest in dream,* Jīva is not able to create chariots etc., merely by his wish. In (the passage),

'In that abide all the worlds; no one transcends that indeed'. (Kā. 5·8)

—being awake while all are asleep, being the resort of all the worlds etc.,—these indeed are possible in the case of the Parama-Puruṣa alone. Therefore, (the highest Puruṣa) creates objects for the Jīvas in order that they might experience the fruit in conformity with their extremely meagre Karman lasting for that period only and fit to be experienced by that particular Jīva alone ॥ 5 ॥

And indicating, indeed on account of the Śruti, and the interpreters of that say ॥ 6 ॥

इतश्च स्वाप्ना अर्थाः न जीवसंकल्पपूर्वकाः, यतः स्वप्नोऽभ्युदयानभ्युदययोः सूचकश्च श्रुतेरवगम्यते

'यदा कर्मसु काम्येषु स्त्रियं स्वप्नेषु पश्यति ।
समृद्धिं तत्र जानीयात्तस्मिन्स्वप्ननिदर्शने ॥'　　(छा. ५।२।८)

इति ।

'अथ स्वप्ने पुरुषं कृष्णं कृष्णदन्तं पश्यति स एनं हन्ति'

इत्यादेश्च । स्वप्नाध्यायविदश्च स्वप्नं शुभाशुभयोः सूचकमाचक्षते । सूचकत्वं च स्वसंकल्पायत्तस्य नोपपद्यते । तथा चाशुभस्यानिष्टत्वाच्छुभस्य सूचकमेव सृष्ट्वा पश्येत् । अतः स्वप्ने सृष्टिरीश्वरेणैव कृता ॥ ६ ॥

सन्ध्याधिकरणं समाप्तम् (१)

तदभावो नाडीषु तच्छ्रुतेरात्मनि च ॥ ७ ॥

(अधिकरण २, सू. ७–८)

[397] इदानीं सुषुप्तिस्थानं परीक्ष्यते । इदमाम्नायते—

'अथ यत्रैतत्सुप्तः समस्तः सम्प्रसन्नः स्वप्नं न कंचन विजानात्यासु तदा नाडीषु सुप्तो भवति'　　(छा. ८।६।३)

इति । तथा

And for this reason, the dream-objects do not proceed from the wish of the Jīva; because it is known from the Sruti that dream is indicative of prosperity and adversity—

'When he sees in dreams a woman in connection with the Karmans desired for, one should know, there in that dream-indication prosperity'.　　(Chā. 5·2·8)

And in

'If he perceives in dream a dark person with dark teeth, he kills him (the dreamer)'.

etc. And those well-versed in chapters dealing with dream, speak of dream as indicative of auspicious and inauspicious (happenings). And being an indication is not appropriate in the case of (a dream) dependent upon one's own wish. And so, an inauspicious thing being undesirable, (the Jīva) having created (a dream) indicative of auspicious things alone, would see it. Therefore, creation in dream is effected by Īśvara himself. ॥ 6 ॥

Here ends the Samdhyādhikaraṇa (1)

The absence of that (dream) in the Nāḍīs, on account of the Śruti (speaking of three places) and in the Ātman. ॥ 7 ॥

(Adhikarana 2, Sūtras 7–8)

[397] Now the place of deep-sleep is examined. It is mentioned in the Sruti—

'Now, where this one asleep, all spread over (controlling), all at ease, does not know any dream,—then he is asleep in these Nādīs.'　　(Chā. 8·6·3)

Similarly—

'अथ यदा सुषुप्तो भवति यदा न कस्यचन वेद हिता नाम नाड्यो द्वासप्ततिः सहस्राणि हृदयात्पुरीततमभिप्रतिष्ठन्ते । ताभिः प्रत्यवसृप्य पुरीतति शेते'
(बृ २।१।१९)

इति । तथा
'यत्रैतत्पुरुषः स्वपिति नाम सता सोम्य तदा सम्पन्नो भवति' (छा ६।८।१)
इति । एवं नाड्यः पुरीतद्ब्रह्म च सुषुप्तिस्थानत्वेन श्रूयन्ते । किमेषां विकल्पः समुच्चयो वेति विशये, निरपेक्षत्वप्रतीतेर्युगपदनेकस्थानवृत्त्यसंभवाच्च विकल्प इति प्राप्ते, उच्यते—तदभाव', इति । तदभावः—स्वप्नाभाव', सुषुप्तिर्नाडीषु पुरीतत्यात्मनि च भवति । एषां स्थानानां समुच्चय इत्यर्थः । कुतः ? तच्छ्रुतेः—त्रयाणां स्थानत्वश्रुतेः । न च कार्यभेदेन समुच्चये संभवति, पाक्षिकबाधगर्भविकल्पो न्याय्यः । संभवति च प्रासादखट्वापर्यङ्कवन्नाड्यादीनां कार्यभेदः । तत्र नाडीपुरीततौ प्रासादखट्वास्थानीयौ । ब्रह्म तु पर्यङ्कस्थानीयम् । अतो ब्रह्मैव साक्षात्सुषुप्तिस्थानम् ॥ ७ ॥

अतः प्रबोधोऽस्मात् ॥ ८ ॥

यतो ब्रह्मैव साक्षात्सुषुप्तिस्थानमतोऽस्माद्ब्रह्मणः, एषां जीवानां प्रबोधः श्रूयमाण उपपद्यते

'Now, when he is in deep sleep, when he does not know of anything, the Nādis called Hitā seventy-two thousand of them, proceed from the heart to the Puritat Being surrounded by them he sleeps in the Puritat' (Br. 2·1·19)

Similarly—
'Where this Purusa is indeed fast asleep, then, he gentle one, becomes closeted with Sat,' (Chā 6 8 1)

—Thus the Nādis, Puritat, and Brahman— (these three) are mentioned in the Sruti as being the place of deep sleep The doubt being there—Are these the alternatives, or are they to be taken together ? — (the prima-facie view) being reached—these are the alternatives on account of the apprehension of these being independent of one another, and on account of the impossibility of their staying in different places simultaneously—it is stated (in reply)—Tadabhāvah Tadabhāvah—the absence of dream, deep sleep exists in the Nādis, in the Puritat, and in the Ātman That is, these places are one collective unit—this (is) the sense Whence ? Tacchruteh|—on account of the Sruti mentioning the three as the place And it is not proper to admit option which involves contradiction of other alternatives, when a collective unit is possible by admitting difference in the working And the difference in working is possible in the Nādis (veins) etc, as in the case of a palace, a cot and a couch There the Nādis and the Purītat are in the place of the palace and the cot, but Brahman is in the place of the couch Therefore, Brahman itself is the direct place of deep sleep ॥ 7 ॥

Therefore, awakening from this. ॥ 8 ॥

Because Brahman alone is the direct place of deep-sleep, therefore the awakening of these Jivas from this the Brahman is appropriate, being stated in the Sruti

'सत आगम्य न विदुः सत आगच्छामहे'　　(छा. ६।१०।२)

इत्यादिषु ॥ ८ ॥

तदभावाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (२)

स एव तु कर्मानुस्मृतिशब्दविधिभ्यः ॥ ९ ॥

(अधिकरण ३, सूत्र ९)

[398] किं सुषुप्त एव प्रबोधसमय उत्तिष्ठति, उत, अन्यः? इति संशये, अस्य सकलोपाधिविनिर्मुक्तस्य ब्रह्मणि संपन्नस्य मुक्तादविलक्षणत्वेन प्राचीनशरीरेन्द्रियादिसंबन्धाभावात्, अन्यः, इति प्राप्ते, उच्यते—स एव तु—इति। तुशब्दः पक्षं व्यावर्तयति। स एवोत्तिष्ठति। कुतः? कर्मानुस्मृतिशब्दविधिभ्यः। कर्म तावत्सुषुप्तेन पूर्वकृतं पुण्यपापरूपं तत्त्वज्ञानात्प्राक्तेनैव भोक्तव्यम्। अनुस्मृतिरपि य एवाहं सुप्तः स एव प्रबुद्धोऽस्मीति। शब्दोऽपि सुप्तप्रबुद्धः स एवेति दर्शयति

'त इह व्याघ्रो वा सिंहो वा वृको वा वराहो वा कीटो वा पतङ्गो वा दंशो वा मशको वा यद्यद्भवन्ति तथा भवन्ति'　　(छा. ६।१०।२)

'Having come from the Sat, they know not that they have come from the Sat'　　(Chā. 6·10·2)

etc. ॥ 8 ॥

Here ends the Tadabhāvādhikaraṇa (2)

But that same, on account of Karman, remembrance, word, and injunction ॥ 9 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 3, Sūtra 9)

[398] The doubt being raised—Does the same person who is in deep sleep get up at the time of waking up, or some one else? — (the prima-facie view) being reached—some one else gets up, on account of the absence of connection with the previous body and sense-organs etc, of this (Jīva), because he is not different from a released soul, being free from all limiting adjuncts and being merged into Brahman—it is stated (in reply)— But that same—the word Tu (but) turns away the above doubt. He alone gets up. Whence? On account of Karman, remembrance, word and injunction. Karman, for the matter of that, of the nature of merit and demerit, done previously by the one in deep sleep, has got to be enjoyed by that same one, prior to the knowledge of Reality. Remembrance (Anusmṛti) (is of the form)—I, the very one who had been asleep, the same am I awakened— Word also (Śruti passage) shows that one who was asleep and who had awakened are one and the same person—

'They here, whatever they are, whether a tiger, or a lion, or a wolf, or a boar, or a worm, or a moth, or a mosquito—, they become (after being awake).　　(Chā. 6·10·2)

इति। विधयश्च मोक्षार्थाः सुषुप्तस्य मुक्तत्वेऽनर्थकाः स्युः। न चासौ सर्वोपाधिविनिर्मुक्त आविर्भूतस्वरूपः,

'तद्यत्रैतत्सुप्तः' (छा. ८।११।१)

इति सुप्तं प्रकृत्य

'नाह खल्वयमेवं संप्रत्यात्मानं जानात्ययमहमस्मीति नो एवेमानि भूतानि विनाशमेवापीतो भवति नाहमत्र भोग्यं पश्यामि' (छा ८।११।१)

इति वचनात्। मुक्तस्य च

'परं ज्योतिरुपसंपद्य स्वेन रूपेणाभिनिष्पद्यते। स तत्र पर्येति जक्षन्क्रीडन्रममाणः' (छा. ८।१२।३)

'स स्वराड्भवति। तस्य सर्वेषु लोकेषु कामचारो भवति।' (छा ७।२५।२)

'सर्वं ह पश्यः पश्यति सर्वमाप्नोति सर्वशः।' (छा. ७।२६।२)

इति सर्वज्ञत्वादि श्रूयते। अतः सुषुप्तः संसरन्नेवापास्तसर्वकरणो ज्ञानभोगाद्यशक्तो विश्रमस्थानं परमात्मानमुपसंपद्याश्वस्तः पुनर्भोगायोत्तिष्ठति ॥ ९ ॥

कर्मानुस्मृतिशब्दविध्यधिकरणं समाप्तम् (३)

And the injunctions for the purpose of salvation would be useless if the one in deep sleep were to be released. But he is not free from all limiting adjuncts, with his own form manifested, on account of the mention (in the Śruti)—introducing the person asleep with—

'Where thus one is asleep—' (Chā 8·11·1)

'Not indeed, this one now knows the Ātman thus,—This one I am, neither again these beings; he goes to destruction alone, not do I see anything fit for enjoyment here.' (Chā. 8 11·1)

And the released soul being omniscient etc, is mentiond in the Śruti in (the passage)

'Having merged into the highest Light, he rises in his own form, he there wanders about, eating, sporting, enjoying' (Chā. 8·12 3)

'He become Self-ruler, in all the worlds there is his movement at will' (Chā. 7·25·2)

'The seer, verily, sees everything, attains to everything every way' (Chā 7·26·2)

—Therefore, one in deep sleep, moving about, with all one's sense-organs discarded, incapable of knowledge, enjoyment etc, having gone unto the highest Atman, the place of rest, refreshed, once again gets up for enjoyment ॥ 9 ॥

Here ends the Karmānusmṛtiśabdavidhyadhikaraṇa (3)

मुग्धेर्धसंपत्तिः परिशेषात् ॥ १० ॥
(अधिकरण ४, सू. १०)

[399] मुग्धमधिकृत्य चिन्त्यते। किमियं मूर्च्छा सुषुप्त्यादिष्वन्यतमावस्था, उत, अवस्थान्तरम्? इति विशये, सुषुप्त्यादीनामन्यतमावस्थायामेव मूर्च्छाप्रसिद्ध्युपपत्तेः, अवस्थान्तरकल्पने प्रमाणाभावात्, अन्यतमावस्थेति प्राप्ते, उच्यते—मुग्धेर्धसंपत्तिः, इति। मुग्धे पुरुषे या तस्यावस्था सा मरणायार्धसंपत्तिः। कुतः? परिशेषात्। न तावत्स्वप्नजागरौ, ज्ञानाभावात्। निमित्तवैरूप्यादाकारवैरूप्याच्च न सुषुप्तिमरणे। निमित्तं हि मूर्च्छाया अभिघातादिः। परिशेषान्मरणायार्धसंपत्तिर्मूर्च्छा। मरणं हि सर्वप्राणदेहसंबन्धोपरतिः। सूक्ष्मप्राणदेहसंबन्धावस्थितिर्मूर्च्छा ॥ १० ॥

मुग्धाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (४)

न स्थानतोपि परस्योभयलिङ्गं सर्वत्र हि ॥ ११ ॥
(अधिकरण ५, सूत्राणि ११–२५)

[400] दोषदर्शनाद्वैराग्योदयाय जीवस्यावस्थाविशेषा निरूपिताः। इदानीं ब्रह्म-

---

Half-merging in the case of one fainted, on account of (the rule of) remainder. ॥ 10 ॥
(Adhikaraṇa 4, Sūtra 10)

[399] Referring to one in a swoon, this is being considered — The doubt being there, — Is this swoon, one of the (three) states, deep sleep etc., or a different state? — (the prima-facie view) being reached, — it is one of the states on account of the swoon being rightly well-known as existing in one of the states-deep sleep etc., and on account of the absence of any means of proof, in fancying that it is some other state, — it is stated (in reply) — Mugdherdhasampattih—In the case of a person who is in swoon, which state he is in, that consists in merging half-way towards death. Whence? On account of (the rule of) remainder. (It is) not, for the matter of that, dream and the waking state, on account of the absence of consciousness; and it is not deep sleep and death, on account of the difference as regards the cause, and on account of the change in the bodily form; for, the cause of the swoon is the stroke with a club etc. On account of what remains, the swoon is but merging halfway towards death; for, death is the complete cessation of the connection of the body with Prāna. The swoon is the persistence of the connection of the body with the subtle Prāṇa ॥ 10 ॥

Here ends the Mugdhādhikaraṇa (4)

Not even from the places (the earth, Ātman) etc., of the highest (Brahman, is possible even a tinge of blemish); for, (Brahman) everywhere, possessed of both characteristics. ॥ 11 ॥
(Adhikarana 5, Sutras 11-25)

[400] The particular states of the Jiva have been described, for the purpose of producing a sense of aversion (towards Saṁsāra) as a result of the

प्रातितृष्णाजननाय प्राप्यस्य ब्रह्मणो निर्दोषत्वकल्याणगुणात्मकत्वप्रतिपादनायारभते । तत्र जागरस्वप्नसुषुप्तिमुग्ध्युत्क्रान्तिषु स्थानेषु तत्तत्स्थानप्रयुक्ता जीवस्य ये दोषास्ते तदन्तर्यामिणः परस्य ब्रह्मणोऽपि तत्र तत्रावस्थितस्य सन्ति, न वेति विचार्यते। किं युक्तम्? सन्तीति। कुतः? तत्तदवस्थशरीरेऽवस्थानात्। ननु

'संभोगप्राप्तिरिति चेन्न वैशेष्यात्' (ब्र. सू. १।२।८)

'स्थित्यदनाभ्यां च' (ब्र. सू. १।३।६)

इत्यादिषु परस्याकर्मवश्यत्वेन दोषाभाव उक्तः। तत्कथमकर्मवश्यस्य परस्य ब्रह्मणस्तत्तत्स्थानसंबन्धाद्दोष उच्यते? इत्थमुच्यते — कर्माण्यपि देहसंबन्धमापादयन्त्यपुरुषार्थजननानि भवन्तीति

'देहयोगाद्वा' (ब्र. सू. ३।२।५)

इत्यत्रोक्तम्। तच्च देहसंबन्धस्यापुरुषार्थत्वेन भवति। इतरथा कर्माण्येव दुःखं जनयिष्यन्ति, किं देहसंबन्धेन? अतोऽकर्मवश्यत्वे सत्यपि नानाविधाशुचिदेहसंबन्धोऽपुरुषार्थ एव। अत-

---

pointing out to the blemishes. Now, in order to create a thirst for the attainment of Brahman, (the Sūtrakāra) begins (the following sections) for propounding that Brahman which is to be reached, is without blemishes (and) is possessed of auspicious qualities. There now, it is discussed whether the blemishes of the Jīva in the places of the departure in waking, dream, deep sleep and swoon occasioned by those various places —whether those (blemishes) belong even to the inner Controller, the Highest Brahman, abiding in those various states or not—What proper? They do belong. Whence? On account of its staying in the body in the different states. I say (says the objector)—In (the Sūtras)—

'If (it be argued that there is) the acquisition of enjoyment, (the reply is) No, on account of the distinction'. (Bra. Sū I·2·8)

'And by the state and the eating'. (Bra. Sū. I·3·6)

etc., the absence of any blemish in the case of the Highest, is stated on account of its not being subject to Karman; then, how can you talk of any blemish in the case of the Highest Brahman not subject to any Karman, as due to the connection with those various places?—(the reply is)—Thus we talk (of it)—It has been stated that the Karmans also by bringing about association with the body become the producers of what is not the highest purpose in life in (the Sūtra)—

'Or, on account of the connection with the body'. (Bra. Sū. 3·2·5)

And that is so, because the association with the body is not for the purpose of salvation; otherwise, if Karmans themselves were to produce misery, what is the use of association with the body? Therefore, although not being subject to Karman, the association with various impure bodies is anyway not salvation.

स्तन्नियमनार्थं स्वेच्छया तत्प्रवेशोऽप्यपुरुषार्थसंबन्धोऽवर्जनीयः । पूयशोणितादिमज्जनं हि स्वेच्छाकारितमप्यपुरुषार्थ एव । यद्यपि जगदेककारणं सर्वज्ञत्वादिकल्याणगुणाकरं च ब्रह्म, तथापि

'यः पृथिव्यां तिष्ठन्' (बृ. ३।७।३)
'य आत्मनि तिष्ठन्' (बृ. ३।७।२२)
'यश्चक्षुषि तिष्ठन्' (बृ. ३।७।१८)
'यो रेतसि तिष्ठन्' (बृ. ३।७।२३)

इत्यादिवचनात्तत्र तत्रावस्थितस्य तत्तत्संबन्धरूपापुरुषार्थाः सन्ति इति—

[401] प्राप्ते, प्रचक्ष्महे—एवं न स्थानतोऽपि परस्य, इति । न पृथिव्यात्मादिस्थानतोऽपि परस्य ब्रह्मणोऽपुरुषार्थगन्धः संभवति । कुतः ? उभयलिङ्गं सर्वत्र हि । यतः सर्वत्र श्रुतिस्मृतिषु परं ब्रह्मोभयलिङ्गमुभयलक्षणमभिधीयते । निरस्तनिखिलदोषत्वकल्याणगुणाकरत्वलक्षणोपेतमित्यर्थः ।

'अपहतपाप्मा विजरो विमृत्युर्विशोकोऽविजिघत्सोऽपिपासः सत्यकामः सत्यसंकल्पः' (छा. ८।१।५)

Therefore, for the purpose of controlling that, even though Brahman were to enter into it at its will, the connection with what is not salvation is unavoidable. For, wallowing into putrid and blood etc., although undertaken at one's own will, is nothing but the reverse of salvation. And although Brahman, the sole cause of the world, is the mine of auspicious qualities, omniscience etc., still, on account of the statement (in the Śruti) in

'Who, abiding in Pṛthvī' (Br 3·7.3)
'Who, abiding in Ātman' (Br. 3·7·22)
'Who, abiding in the eye' (Br. 3·7·18)
'Who, abiding in the semen' (Br. 3·7·23)

etc., there are activities not conducive to salvation, of the form of connection with the various things of Brahman abiding in the various places—

[401] This (prima-facie view) being reached, we reply—Na sthānatopi parasya— Not even from the places, the earth, Atman etc., of the Highest Brahman is possible even a tinge of what is not salvation. Whence? Ubhayalingam sarvatra hi; for, everywhere in the Sruti and Smṛti works, the Highest Brahman is described as Ubhayalingam — endowed with the characteristics of both, having all blemishes removed, and being the mine of all auspicious qualities. For, Brahman is apprehended as possessed of both characteristics from the Sruti and Smṛti (passages)—

'With sins destroyed, ageless, deathless, bereft of grief, bereft of hunger, without thirst, with desires fulfilled, with thoughts fulfilled' (Chā. 8·1·5)

'समस्तकल्याणगुणात्मकोऽसौ स्वशक्तिलेशोद्धृतभूतसर्गः ।
तेजोबलैश्वर्यमहावबोधसुवीर्यशक्त्यादिगुणैकराशिः ।
परः पराणां सकला न यत्र क्लेशादयः सन्ति परावरेशे ॥'
(वि पु. ६।५।८४-८५)
'समस्तहेयरहितं विष्ण्वाख्यं परमं पदम्' (वि पु १।२२।५१)

इत्यादिश्रुतिस्मृतिभ्य उभयलक्षणं हि ब्रह्मावगतम् ॥ ११ ॥

भेदादिति चेन्न प्रत्येकमतद्वचनात् ॥ १२ ॥

[402] यथा जीवस्य प्रजापतिवाक्यावगतापहतपाप्मत्वाद्युभयलिङ्गस्यापि देवादिदेहयोगरूपावस्थाभेदादपुरुषार्थयोगः, तथान्तर्यामिणः परस्यापि स्वतोऽपहतपाप्मत्वाद्युभयलिङ्गस्य तत्तद्देवादिशरीरयोगरूपावस्थाभेदादपुरुषार्थयोगोऽवर्जनीयः, इति चेत्—तन्न, प्रत्येकमतद्वचनात्—

'यः पृथिव्यां तिष्ठन्' (बृ ३।७।३)
'य आत्मनि तिष्ठन्' (बृ ३।७।२२)

इत्यादिषु प्रतिपर्यायम्,—स त आत्मान्तर्याम्यमृतः—इत्यन्तर्यामिणोऽमृतत्ववचनेन तत्र तत्र

'He, possessing all auspicious qualities, who has raised up the creation of beings, by an iota of his power, the sole mass of attributes such as, lustre, strength overlordship, great enlightenment, excellent virility and power, etc, the high of the high, in whom-the Controller of the high and the low, exist not any affliction etc.'
(V P. 6·5 84–85)

'The highest place bereft of everything that is fit to be abandoned, called Visnu' (V P 1 22 51)

॥ 11 ॥

If it be said, on account of the difference (of the states). —(the answer is)— No, on account of the contrary statement in each case. ॥ 12 ॥

[402] If (it be said) that just as in the case of the Jiva who is known to be possessed of both the characteristics, having all the sins destroyed, etc, from the statement of Prajāpati, there is connection with what is not salvation, on account of the difference of the states in the form of connection with the bodies of gods etc, in the same way, in the case even of the Highest, the inner Controller who himself is possessed of both the characteristics, having the sins destroyed, etc,, on account of the difference of the states in the form of connection with the various bodies of gods etc, connection with the reverse of salvation is unavoidable— (Our reply is)— Not so, Pratyekamatadvacanāt—because of the statement of its being not that in every case In (the passages)

'Who, abiding in Prthivi' (Br. 3·7·3)
'Who, abiding in Ātman' (Br 3 7 22)

etc, for every alternative there is the statement about the inner Controller being immortal—He (is) your Atman, the inner Controller, immortal—

स्वेच्छया नियमनं कुर्वतस्तत्तत्संबन्धप्रयुक्तापुरुषार्थप्रतिषेधात् । जीवस्य तु तत्स्वरूपं तिरोहितमिति

'पराभिध्यानात्तु तिरोहितम्' (ब्र. सू. ३।२।४)

इत्यत्रोक्तम् ।

[403] ननु स्वेच्छया कुर्वतोऽपि तत्तद्वस्तुस्वभावायत्तापुरुषार्थसंबन्धोऽवर्जनीयः, इत्युक्तम् । नैतद्युक्तम् । न ह्यचिद्वस्त्वपि स्वभावतोऽपुरुषार्थरूपम् । कर्मवश्यानां तु कर्मस्वभावानुगुण्येन परमपुरुषसंकल्पादेकमेव वस्तु कालभेदेन पुरुषभेदेन च सुखाय दुःखाय च भवति । वस्तुस्वरूपप्रयुक्ते तु तादृप्ये सर्वं सर्वदा सर्वस्य सुखायैव दुःखायैव वा स्यात् ! न चैवं दृश्यते । तथा चोक्तम्—

'नरकस्वर्गसंज्ञे वै पापपुण्ये द्विजोत्तम ॥
यत्त्वेकमेव दुःखाय सुखायेर्ष्योगमाय च ।
कोपाय च यतस्तस्माद्वस्तु वस्त्वात्मकं कुतः ॥
तदेव प्रीतये भूत्वा पुनर्दुःखाय जायते ।
तदेव कोपाय यतः प्रसादाय च जायते ॥

---

and there is the repudiation of the reverse of salvation, prompted by the connection with various entities while carrying out the control at his will at the various places. In the case of the Jiva, on the other hand, that his own nature has been concealed is stated here in (the Sūtra)

'*On account of the reflection of the Highest, however, that is concealed*'. (Bra. Sū. 3·2 4)

[403] I say (says the objector)—It has been stated though (the inner Controller is) acting at his sweet will, connection with the reverse of salvation dependent upon the natures of the various entities is unavoidable. (We reply)— This (is) not proper. Not indeed, even a non-sentient thing is by nature itself, the reverse of salvation. In the case of those that are subject to Karman, however, through the wish itself of the highest Purusa, in conformity with the nature of Karman, one and the same thing may be conducive to happiness and to misery, owing to the difference in time, and the difference of the Purusas. But if being of that nature were to be prompted by the nature of the entity, everything always would be conducive to happiness alone or to misery alone for all ! But it is not seen thus. To that same effect, has been stated—

'*O best of Brāhmanas, demerit and merit are, verily, designated as hell and heaven*

Because, one and the same thing is for misery, for happiness, and for the production of envy and anger — therefore, how can a thing be constituted (only) of the nature of a thing?

That same having been conducive to gratification is, again, produced for misery, because that same is produced for anger, and for gratification.

तस्माद्दुःखात्मकं नास्ति न च किञ्चित्सुखात्मकम्' । (वि. पु २।६।४४–४७)

इति । अतो जीवस्य कर्मवश्यत्वात्तत्तत्कर्मानुगुण्येन तत्तद्वस्तुसंबन्ध एवापुरुषार्थः स्यात् । परस्य तु ब्रह्मणः स्वाधीनस्य स एव संबन्धस्तत्तद्विचित्रनियमनरूपलीलारसायैव स्यात् ॥१२॥

अपि चैवमेके ॥ १३ ॥

अपि चैके शाखिन एकस्मिन्नेव देहसंयोगे जीवस्यापुरुषार्थं परस्य तु तदभावं नियमनरूपैश्वर्यायत्तं दीप्तियोगं च स्वशब्देनाधीयते—

'द्वा सुपर्णा सयुजा सखाया समानं वृक्षं परिषस्वजाते ।
तयोरन्यः पिप्पलं स्वाद्वत्त्यनश्नन्न्योऽभिचाकशीति ॥' (मु ३।१।१)

इति ॥ १३ ॥

[404] अथ स्यात्—

'अनेन जीवेनात्मनानुप्रविश्य नामरूपे व्याकरवाणि' (छा. ६।३।२)

इति ब्रह्मात्मकजीवानुप्रवेशपूर्वकं नामरूपव्याकरणमिति, ब्रह्मणोऽपि तदात्मभूतस्य देवमनुष्यादिरूपत्वं तत्तन्नामभाक्त्वं चास्ति । ततश्च ब्राह्मणो यजेत, इत्यादिविधिनिषेधशास्त्रगोचरत्वेन कर्मवश्यत्वमवर्जनीयम्, इति—तत्राह—

Therefore, there is nothing constituted of misery or constituted of happiness (alone).' (V. P. 2·6·44–47)

Therefore, because Jīva is subject to Karman, in his case, connection itself with the various things in conformity with the various Karmans, is the *reverse* of salvation. But in the case of the Highest self-dependent Brahman that same connection would be for the mere sportive interest of the form of the various variegated control ॥ 12 ॥

And further, thus some ॥ 13 ॥

And further, students of some recensions read with the specific word used, in one and the same connection with the body, the reverse of salvation, but the absence thereof and connection with refulgence dependent upon overlordship in the form of control in the case of the Highest, in,

'Two birds (with good feathers) together, friends, cling to the same tree,—one of the two eats the sweet fruit of the Pippala; and not eating, another continues to look on' (Mu. 3·1·1)

॥ 13 ॥

[404] (The objector says)—Now it may be in (the passage)

'Having entered into within, with this Living Self, I would modify name and form' (Chā. 6·3·2)

there is the modification in name and form, preceded by the subsequent entrance of the Jīva with Brahman as his Ātman ; so, in the case of Brahman also, which is the Ātman of that, there is the form of god, man etc , and the applicability of those various names etc. And thereupon, being subject to Karman is unavoidable, on account of its coming within the province of the Śāstric injunctions and prohibitions such as—A Brāhmana shall sacrifice—There says (the Sūtrakāra)—

अरूपवदेव हि तत्प्रधानत्वात् ॥ १४ ॥

देवादिशरीरानुप्रवेशे तेन तेन रूपेण युक्तमप्यरूपवदेव तद्ब्रह्म रूपरहिततुल्यमेव । जीववच्छरीरित्वनिबन्धनं कर्मवश्यत्वमस्य न विद्यत इत्यर्थः । कुतः? तन्निर्वाहकत्वेन प्रधानत्वात् ।

'आकाशो ह वै नामरूपयोर्निर्वहिता । ते यदन्तरा तद्ब्रह्म' (छा. ८।१४।१)

इति सर्वानुप्रवेशेऽपि नामरूपकार्यास्पर्शेन नामरूपयोर्निर्वोढृत्वमेव ब्रह्मणः प्रतिपादयति ।

ननु तच्छरीरत्वेन तदन्तर्यामित्वे कथमरूपवदिति रूपसंबन्धरहिततुल्यत्वमुच्यते? इत्थम्—यथा जीवस्य तत्तज्जन्यसुखदुःखभाक्त्वेन तत्तद्रूपसंबन्धः, तथा तदभावात्परस्य ब्रह्मणोऽरूपवत्त्वम् । विधिनिषेधशास्त्राण्यपि कर्मवश्यमेवाधिकुर्वन्ति । तस्मादरूपतुल्यमेव परं ब्रह्म । ततश्चान्तर्यामिरूपेणावस्थितमपि ब्रह्म निरस्तनिखिलदोषत्वकल्याणगुणाकरत्वरूपोभयलिङ्गमेव ॥ १४ ॥

[405] ननु च

'सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म' (तै २।१)

For, it is void of any form whatsoever, on account of that being the prominent ॥ 14 ॥

Although endowed with the various forms on subsequent entrance into bodies of gods etc, that Brahman is Arūpavadeva—indeed equal to being void of form That is to say, like the Jīva, being subject to Karman dependent upon being possessed of a body, does not belong to it. Whence? On account of being prominent owing to being the manifester of that. Although there is the subsequent entrance into everything, (the passage)

Ākāśa, verily, is the manifester of name and form; within what the two are, that (is) Brahman'. (Chā. 8 14·1)

propounds Brahman as having the nature of the manifester itself of name and form, not being touched by the effects of name and form.

I say (says the objector)—When Brahman is the inner Controller, by having that as its body, how could it be said that Arūpavat (is) 'equal to being divested of the connection with the body?—(We reply)—Thus—Just as in the case of the Jīva, there is the connection with the various forms on account of his enjoying happiness and misery produced by the various things, in the same way, on account of the absence of that there is the absence of form in the case of the Highest Brahman The Śāstric passages dealing with injunction and prohibition, have application to one subject to Karman alone Therefore, the Highest Brahman, verily, is equal to one having no form And therefore, Brahman although abiding in the form of the inner Controller, is verily, possessed of both the characteristics viz having all the blemishes removed, and being the mine of all auspicious qualities ॥ 14 ॥

[405] I say again (says the objector)—In (the passage)

'*Existence, Knowledge, Infinite Brahman*' (Tai 2 1)

इत्यादिभिर्निर्विशेषप्रकाशैकस्वरूपं ब्रह्मावगम्यते। अन्यत्तु सर्वज्ञत्वसत्यसंकल्पत्वजगत्कारणत्वसर्वान्तरात्मत्वसत्यकामत्वादिकम्

'*नेति नेति*' (बृ. ४।२।४)

इत्यादिभिः प्रतिषिध्यमानत्वेन मिथ्याभूतमित्यवगन्तव्यम्। तत्कथं कल्याणगुणाकरत्वनिरस्तनिखिलदोषत्वरूपोभयलिङ्गत्वं ब्रह्मणः ? इत्यत आह—

प्रकाशवच्चावैयर्थ्यात् ॥ १५ ॥

यथा

'*सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म*' (तै. २।१)

इत्यादिवाक्यावैयर्थ्यात्प्रकाशस्वरूपत्वं ब्रह्मणोऽभ्युपगम्यते, तथा सत्यसंकल्पत्वसर्वज्ञत्वसर्वजगत्कारणत्वसर्वात्मकत्वनिरस्तनिखिलाविद्यादिदोषत्वाद्यभिधायिवाक्यावैयर्थ्यादुभयलिङ्गमेव ब्रह्म ॥ १५ ॥

आह च तन्मात्रम् ॥ १६ ॥

किं च

'*सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तम्*' (तै २।१)

इत्यादि वाक्यं ब्रह्मणः प्रकाशस्वरूपतामात्रं प्रतिपादयति, नान्यत्सत्यसंकल्पत्वादिकं वाक्यान्तरावगतं निषेधति।

'*नेति नेति*' (बृ. ४।२।४)

इति च निषेधस्य विषयोऽनन्तरमेव वक्ष्यते ॥ १६ ॥

---

etc., Brahman is apprehended as having the sole nature of attributeless light, but the other (nature) should be known as false, as it is being repudiated in

'*Not this, not this*' (Br. 4·2·4)

etc.,—being omniscient, being with thoughts fulfilled, being the cause of the world, being the inmost Ātman of all, being with desires fulfilled, etc.,—so how can Brahman be possessed of both characteristics viz. being the mine of auspicious qualities, and having all blemishes removed ? — To this (in reply the Sūtrakāra) says—

And like the light, on account of the significance. ॥ 15 ॥

Just as, in order that (the passages)

'*Existence, Knowledge, Infinite Brahman*' (Tai 2·1)

etc., be not without significance, Brahman is admitted to have light as its nature—so, in order that there should be the significance of the passages denoting having thoughts fulfilled, omniscience, being the cause of the entire world, being the Ātman of all, having all the blemishes Avidyā etc, removed—Brahman, verily, is possessed of both the characteristics. ॥ 15 ॥

And says that much. ॥ 16 ॥

Furthermore, the passage

'*Existence, Knowlege, Infinite Brahman*' (Tai. 2·1)

etc., propounds merely that Brahman is possessed of the nature of light ; (it) does not repudiate other things known from other (Śruti) passages, such as having the thoughts fulfilled etc. The subject of the repudiation in

'*Not this, not this*' (Br. 4·2·4)

would be mentioned just below. ॥ 16 ॥

दर्शयति चाथो अपि स्मर्यते ॥ १७ ॥

दर्शयति च वेदान्तवाक्यगणः कल्याणगुणाकरत्वं निरस्तनिखिलदोषत्वं च—

'तमीश्वराणां परमं महेश्वरं तं दैवतानां परमं च दैवतम् ।' (श्वे. ६।७)

'स कारणं करणाधिपाधिपो न चास्य कश्चिज्जनिता न चाधिपः ।' (श्वे. ६।९)

'न तस्य कार्यं करणं च विद्यते न तत्समश्चाभ्यधिकश्च दृश्यते ।
परास्य शक्तिर्विविधैव श्रूयते स्वाभाविकी ज्ञानबलक्रिया च ॥' (श्वे ६।८)

'यः सर्वज्ञः सर्वविद्यस्य ज्ञानमयं तपः ।' (मु. १।१।९)

'भीषास्माद्वातः पवते । भीषोदेति सूर्यः ।' (तै. २।८।१)

'स एको ब्रह्मण आनन्दः' (तै २।८)

'यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते अप्राप्य मनसा सह ।
आनन्दं ब्रह्मणो विद्वान्न बिभेति कुतश्चन ॥' (तै. २।९)

'निष्कलं निष्क्रियं शान्तं निरवद्यं निरञ्जनम् ।' (श्वे. ६।१९)

इत्यादि । स्मर्यते च—

'यो मामजमनादिं च वेत्ति लोकमहेश्वरम् ।' (गीता १०।३)

And (the Śruti) shows, and the Smṛti also says. ॥ 17 ॥

The (following) host again of Vedānta passages shows (Brahman's) being the mine of auspicious qualities, and being with all blemishes removed.—

'Him, the Highest, great Lord of the lords, and him, the highest Deity of deities' (Śve. 6·7)

'He (is) the cause, the Lord of the lord of the sense-organs, and there is no progenitor for him, nor a Lord' (Śve 6·9)

'In his case, there is no effect (body) and the sense-organs; there is not to be seen any one equal to him or superior; his supreme power is heard to be definitely multifarious, and knowledge, strength, activity (are all) natural (in him)' (Śve. 6·8)

'Who, omniscient, all-knower, whose penance is constituted of knowledge' (Mu. 1·1·9)

'Through fear from him, the wind blows on; through fear, rises the Sun' (Tai. 2·8·1)

'That alone is the bliss of Brahman' (Tai. 2·8)

'From what words turn away, along with the mind, without reaching (the same); one knowing the bliss of Brahman, fears not from anywhere' (Tai. 2·9)

'Without parts, without action, tranquil, blameless, stainless' (Śve. 6 19)

etc. And in the Smṛti it is stated—

'Who knows me as unborn, beginningless and the Great Lord of the worlds' (Gītā 10·3)

'विष्टभ्याहमिदं कृत्स्नमेकांशेन स्थितो जगत् ।' (गीता १०।४२)

'मयाध्यक्षेण प्रकृतिः सूयते सचराचरम् ।
हेतुनानेन कौन्तेय जगद्विपरिवर्तते ॥' (गीता ९।१०)

'उत्तमः पुरुषस्त्वन्यः परमात्मेत्युदाहृतः ।
यो लोकत्रयमाविश्य बिभर्त्यव्यय ईश्वरः ॥' (गीता १५।१७)

'सर्वज्ञः सर्वकृत्सर्वशक्तिज्ञानबलर्द्धिमान् ।
अन्यूनश्चाप्यवृद्धिश्च स्वाधीनोऽनादिमान्वशी ॥
क्लमतन्द्राभयक्रोधकामादिभिरसंयुतः ।
निरवद्यः परः प्राप्तेर्निरधिष्ठोऽक्षरक्रमः ॥' (वि. पु ५।१।४६-४७)

इत्यादि । अतः सर्वावस्थावस्थितस्यापि ब्रह्मण उभयलिङ्गत्वान्न तत्तत्स्थानप्रयुक्ता दोषाः परं ब्रह्म स्पृशन्ति ॥ १७ ॥

अत एव चोपमा सूर्यकादिवत् ॥ १८ ॥

यतो नानाविधेषु स्थानेषु स्थितस्यापि परस्य ब्रह्मणो न तत्प्रयुक्तदोषभाक्त्वम्, अत एव जलदर्पणादिप्रतिबिम्बितसूर्यादिवत्परमात्मा तत्र तत्रावस्थितोऽपि निर्दोषः, इति शास्त्रेषूपमा क्रियते

'Having enveloped this entire world by a portion, I stay on' (Gītā 10·42)

'With me as a supervisor, the Prakṛti produces (the world) along with the movable and the immovable; and by this reason, (O) son of Kuntī, the world goes on, revolving' (Gītā 9·10)

'But the highest Puruṣa (is) another, cited as the Paramātman, who, the Lord immutable, supports the three worlds, having entered into (them)' (Gītā 15·17)

'Omniscient, doer of everything, possessed of all power, knowledge, strength, and prosperity; without decrease and without increase, self-dependent, having no beginning, the Controller.

Not associated with exhaustion, idleness, fear, wrath, desire etc., blameless, beyond reach, independent, and with an imperishable course.' (V. P. 5·1·46–47)

etc. Therefore, even though Brahman abides in all states,—because Brahman is possessed of both the characteristics, the blemishes pertaining to various places do not touch Brahman ॥ 17 ॥

And for this very reason, there is the comparison—like the reflection of the Sun etc. ॥ 18 ॥

Because the Highest Brahman does not share in the blemishes pertaining to them, although abiding in various places,—for this very reason, like the reflected Sun etc., in water, mirror etc., the Paramātman is free from blemish, although staying in various places—this comparison is made in the Śāstras (Smṛtis)—

'आकाशमेकं हि यथा घटादिषु पृथग्भवेत् ।
तथात्मैको ह्यनेकस्थो जलाधारेष्विवांशुमान् ॥
एक एव हि भूतात्मा भूते भूते व्यवस्थितः ।
एकधा बहुधा चैव दृश्यते जलचन्द्रवत् ॥'　　(याज्ञ. स्मृ. ३।१४३-४)

इत्यादिषु ॥ १८ ॥

[406] अत्र चोदयति—

अम्बुवदग्रहणात्तु न तथात्वम् ॥ १९ ॥

तुशब्दश्चोद्यं द्योतयति । अम्बुवदिति सप्तम्यन्ताद्वतिः । अम्बुदर्पणादिषु यथा सूर्यमुखादयो गृह्यन्ते, न तथा पृथिव्यादिषु स्थानेषु परमात्मा गृह्यते । अम्ब्वादिषु हि सूर्यादयो भ्रान्त्या तत्रस्था इव गृह्यन्ते न परमार्थतस्तत्रस्थाः । इह तु

'यः पृथिव्यां तिष्ठन्'　　(बृ. ३।७।३)
'योऽप्सु तिष्ठन्'　　(बृ. ३।७।४)
'य आत्मनि तिष्ठन्'　　(बृ. ३।७।२२)

इत्येवमादिना परमार्थत एव परमात्मा पृथिव्यादिषु स्थितो गृह्यते । अतः सूर्यादेरम्बुदर्पणादिप्रयुक्तदोषाननुषङ्गस्तत्र तत्र स्थित्यभावादेव । अतो न तथात्वं दार्ष्टान्तिकस्य, न दृष्टान्ततुल्यत्वमित्यर्थः । १९ ॥

'For, just as the one Ākāśa becomes different in jar, etc., similarly, one Ātman, indeed, resides in many places like the Sun in (various) stores of water.

One and the same Ātman of beings, stays well in various beings, and is, indeed, seen as being one, and as being manifold like the (reflection of) the Moon in water'.　　(Yā. Smr. 3·143–4)

etc. ॥ 18 ॥

[406] Here (the objector) objects—

But not apprehending as in the case of water, it is not like that ॥ 19 ॥

The word Tu indicates the objection. In the expression Ambuvat the termination Vat in used with the locative (Ambuni iva). Just as the Sun, face etc., are apprehended in water, mirror, etc.,—not in the same way is the Paramātman apprehended in various places, Pṛthivi etc.; for, in the case of water etc., the Sun etc, are apprehended as though being there through misconception, not as abiding there in reality. But here, in (passages)

'Who, abiding in Pṛthivī'.　　(Br. 3·7·3)
'Who, abiding in waters'.　　(Br. 3·7·4)
'Who, abiding in Ātman'.　　(Br. 3·7·22)

and such others, the Paramātman is apprehended as abiding in the earth etc.' in reality. Therefore, the non-contact of the Sun etc., with the blemishes caused by water, mirror etc, is due to not being present itself in those various places. Therefore, the thing to be compared is not like that,—that is to say, is not possessed of the equality with the illustration. ॥ 19 ॥

परिहरति—

वृद्धिह्रासभाक्त्वमन्तर्भावादुभयसामञ्जस्यादेवं दर्शनाच्च ॥ २० ॥

पृथिव्यादिस्थानान्तर्भावात्स्थानिनः परस्य ब्रह्मणः स्वरूपतो गुणतश्च पृथिव्यादिस्थानगतवृद्धिह्रासादिदोषभाक्त्वमात्रं सूर्यादिदृष्टान्तेन निवर्त्यते। कथमिदमवगम्यते? उभयसामञ्जस्यादेवम्। उभयदृष्टान्तसामञ्जस्यादेवमिति निश्चीयते।

'आकाशमेकं हि यथा घटादिषु पृथग्भवेद्।

..................जलाधारेष्विवांशुमान्॥' (याज्ञ. स्मृ ३।१४३)

इति दोषवत्स्वनेकेषु वस्तुषु वस्तुतोऽवस्थितस्याकाशस्य वस्तुतोऽनवस्थितस्यांशुमतश्चोभयस्य दृष्टान्तस्योपादानं हि परमात्मनः पृथिव्यादिगतदोषभाक्त्वानिवर्तनमात्रे प्रतिपाद्ये समञ्जसं भवति। घटकरकादिषु यथा वृद्धिह्रासभाक्षु पृथक्पृथक्संयुज्यमानमप्याकाशं वृद्धिह्रासादिदोषैर्न स्पृश्यते यथा च जलाधारेषु विषमेषु दृश्यमानोंऽशुमांस्तद्गतवृद्धिह्रासादिभिर्न स्पृश्यते, तथायं परमात्मा पृथिव्यादिषु नानाकारेष्वचेतनेषु चेतनेषु च स्थितः, तत्तद्गतवृद्धिह्रासादिदोषैरसंस्पृष्टः सर्वत्र वर्तमानोऽप्येक एवास्पृष्टदोषगन्धः कल्याणगुणाकर एव।

एतदुक्तं भवति—यथा जलादिषु वस्तुतोऽनवस्थितस्यांशुमतो हेत्वभावाज्जलादिदोषा-

---

(The Sūtrakāra) refutes (the above view)—

Sharing in increase and decrease, on account of being included, on account of both (illustrations) being reasonable thus, and on account of this being seen. ॥ 20 ॥

By the illustration of the Sun etc., is refuted merely sharing in the blemishes, such as increase and decrease belonging to the places, the earth etc., in its real nature, and as attributes, in the case of the Highest Brahman abiding in some place being included within the places, the earth etc. How is this known? Ubhayasāmañjasyāt evam (on account of both (illustrations) being reasonable thus) on account of the reasonableness of both the illustrations this is ascertained. In (the passage)

'For, as the one Ākāśa may become different in jars etc.,
........like the Sun in stores of water' (Yā. Smr. 3·143)

—in the case of the Ākāśa that does abide in reality in many entities full of blemishes, and in the case of the Sun not abiding in reality—the use of both the illustrations becomes reasonable when it is to be propounded that the Paramātman is to be excluded only from sharing in the blemishes belonging to the earth etc. Just as the sky even though being conjoined separately with jar, hail etc., that are subject to increase and decrease, is not touched by the blemishes—increase, decrease etc., and just as the Sun being seen in the uneven reservoirs of water is not touched by increase, decrease etc., belonging to them—similarly, this Paramātman abiding in sentient and non-sentient entities of different forms, the earth etc., untouched by blemishes, increase, decrease etc., belonging to those, although existing everywhere, is one alone without any tinge of blemish touching him, the mine of auspicious qualities alone.

This is what is intended to be said— Just as in the case of the Sun not really abiding in water etc., there is no contact with the blemishes of water

नाभिष्वङ्गः, तथा पृथिव्यादिष्ववस्थितस्यापि परमात्मनो दोषप्रत्यनीकाकारतया दोषहेत्वभावान्न दोषसंबन्धः, इति ।

दर्शनाच्च—दृश्यते चैवं सर्वात्मना साधर्म्याभावेऽपि विवक्षितांशसाधर्म्याद्दृष्टान्तोपादानं सिंह इव माणवकः, इत्यादौ । अतः स्वभावतो, निरस्तनिखिलाज्ञानादिदोषगन्धस्य समस्तकल्याणगुणाकरस्य पृथिव्यादिस्थानतोऽपि न दोषसंभवः ॥ २० ॥

[407] अथ स्यात्—

'द्वे वाव ब्रह्मणो रूपे मूर्तं चामूर्तं च' (बृ. २।३।१)

इति प्रकृत्य समस्तस्थूलसूक्ष्मरूपं प्रपञ्चं ब्रह्मणो रूपत्वेन परामृश्य,

'तस्य ह वा एतस्य पुरुषस्य रूपं यथा माहारजनं वासः' (बृ २।३।६)

इत्यादिनाकारविशेषं चाभिधाय,

'अथात आदेशो नेति नेतीति न ह्येतस्मादिति नेत्यन्यत्परमस्ति' (बृ २।३।६)

इति सर्वं प्रकृतं ब्रह्मणः प्रकारमितिशब्देन परामृश्य, तत्सर्वं प्रतिषिध्य, सर्वविशेषाधिष्ठानं

---

etc, on account of the absence of any reason thereof, in the same way, in the case of the Paramātman although residing in the earth etc, there is no contact with blemish, on account of the absence of any reason thereof, as he has a form opposed to blemishes

Darśanācca—and it is thus seen,—that there is the use of an illustration, on account of similarity in respect of a desired portion, even though there is the absence of complete similarity, as in—Mānavaka (is) like a lion,—etc, Therefore, in the case of (the Paramātman) who has from his very nature, the tinge of blemish of all Ajñāna etc, removed, who is the mine of all auspicious qualities, there is no possibility of any blemish, even on account of the places, the earth etc. ॥ 20 ॥

[407] (The objector says)—It may be in (the passage) referring to

'Two, verily, are the forms of Brahman—incarnate and formless' (Br 2 3 1)

—having referred to the worldly existence having the form of the entire subtle and gross (creation,) as the form of Brahman, and having mentioned a particular form in

'There is the form verily, indeed, of this Purusa like the saffron-coloured raiment' (Br 2 3 6)

etc, and having referred in (the passage)

'Now therefore, the instruction—Not this, not this Not, indeed—from this one, not anything beyond it exists' (Br 2 3 6)

to everything introduced by the word Iti as the mode of Brahman, having repudiated all that, (the Sruti) points out that Brahman is pure

सन्मात्रमेव ब्रह्म, विशेषास्त्वेवंविधं स्वस्वरूपमजानता ब्रह्मणा कल्पिता इति दर्शयति। अतः, कथमुभयलिङ्गत्वं ब्रह्मणः ?—इत्यत्राह—

प्रकृतैतावत्त्वं हि प्रतिषेधति ततो ब्रवीति च भूयः ॥ २१ ॥

नैतदुपपद्यते यद्ब्रह्मणः प्रकृतविशेषवत्त्वम्

'नेति नेति' (बृ. २।३।६)

इति प्रतिषिध्यत इति,—तथा सति भ्रान्तजल्पितायमानत्वात्। न हि ब्रह्मणो विशेषणतया प्रमाणान्तराप्रज्ञातं सर्वं तद्विशेषणत्वेनोपदिश्य, पुनस्तदेवानुन्मत्तः प्रतिषेधति। यद्यपि निर्दिश्यमानेषु केचन पदार्थाः प्रमाणान्तरप्रसिद्धास्तथापि तेषां ब्रह्मणः प्रकारत्वमप्रज्ञातमेव। इतरेषां तु स्वरूपं ब्रह्मणः प्रकारत्वं चाप्रज्ञातम्। अतस्तेषामनुवादासंभवादत्रैवोपदिश्यन्ते। अतस्तन्निषेधो नोपपद्यते। यस्मादेवं तस्मात् प्रकृतैतावत्त्वम् ब्रह्मणः प्रतिषेधतीदं वाक्यम्। ये ब्रह्मणो विशेषाः प्रकृतास्तद्विशिष्टतया ब्रह्मणः प्रतीयमानेयत्ता

'नेति नेति' (बृ. २।३।६)

इति प्रतिषिध्यते। नेति नेति—नैवं नैवम्। उक्तप्रकारमात्रविशिष्टं न भवति ब्रह्म। उक्तप्रकारविशिष्टतया या ब्रह्मण इयत्ता प्रकृता सा, अत्र, इतिशब्देन परामृश्यते, इत्यर्थः। यतश्च निषेधा-

---

existence alone, the basis of all particularities, and the particularities are imagined by Brahman not knowing its nature of this form. Therefore, how is Brahman possessed of both characteristics? There (the Sūtrakāra) says—

For (the passage) repudiates (Brahman's) being *so much*, the matter in hand, and speaks of again. ॥ 21 ॥

It is not proper to say that in (the passage)

'Not this, not this' (Br. 2·3·6)

is repudiated Brahman being possessed of the particular nature under discussion; in that case, it would be amounting to the prattle of one gone mad. Not, indeed, having taught as the attributes of Brahman, everything not known as attributes by other means of proof, would one not out of senses repudiate the same. Although among those pointed out, some objects are established by other means of proof, still their being the mode of Brahman is definitely not known In the case of the others, however, their nature as well as their being the mode of Brahman are unknown. Therefore, there being no possibility of their mention being carried forward, they are taught here itself. Therefore, the repudiation of them is not right. Because it is so, therefore, this passage repudiates Brahman being so much, the matter in hand—what particular aspects of Brahman are the matter in hand—the limit being apprehended of Brahman as particularised by them, is repudiated by

'Not thus, not thus' (Br. 2·3·6)

Neti neti—not thus, not thus. Brahman is not particularised by only the mode referred to. What limit of Brahman as particularised by the mode referred to, is the matter in hand—that is referred to here by the word Iti—this (is) the sense; and because after the repudiation it speaks again of the host of qualities in Brahman, therefore, (the Śruti) repudiates in the case of

नन्तरं ब्रह्मणो भूयो गुणजातं ब्रवीति, अतश्च प्रकृतविशेषयोगित्वमात्रतां ब्रह्मणः प्रतिषेधति। ब्रवीति हि भूयो गुणजातम्

'न ह्येतस्मादिति नेत्यन्यत्परमस्ति। अथ नामधेयं सत्यस्य सत्यमिति। प्राणा वै सत्यं तेषामेष सत्यम्' (बृ. २।३।६)

इति। अयमर्थः—इति नेति नेति यद्ब्रह्म प्रतिपादितं तस्मादेतस्मादन्यद्वस्तु परं न ह्यस्ति। ब्रह्मणोऽन्यत्स्वरूपतो गुणतश्चोत्कृष्टं नास्तीत्यर्थः। तस्य च ब्रह्मणः सत्यस्य सत्यमिति नामधेयम्। तस्य च निर्वचनं—प्राणा वै सत्यं तेषामेष सत्यम्—इति। प्राणशब्देन प्राणसाहचर्याज्जीवाः परामृश्यन्ते। ते तावत्सत्यम्, वियदादिवत्स्वरूपान्यथाभावरूपपरिणामाभावात्।

तेषामेष सत्यम्। तेभ्योऽप्येष परमपुरुषः सत्यम्। जीवानां कर्मानुगुण्येन ज्ञानसंकोचविकासौ विद्येते। परमपुरुषस्य त्वपहतपाप्मनस्तौ न विद्येते। अतस्तेभ्योऽप्येष सत्यम्। अतश्चैवं वाक्यशेषोदितगुणजातयोगात्

'नेति नेति' (बृ. २।३।६)

इति ब्रह्मणः सविशेषत्वं न प्रतिषिध्यते, अपि तु पूर्वप्रकृतेयत्तामात्रम्। अत उभयलिङ्गमेव परं ब्रह्म ॥ २१ ॥

Brahman only the limit connected with the particularity which is the matter in hand; for (the Śruti) speaks again of the host of qualities in

'Not indeed from this one, not anything beyond it exists. And there is the name, the truth of truth; Prāṇas, verily, are truth, of them this is the truth.' (Br. 2·3·6)

—This is the sense—what Brahman is propounded in—Not thus, not thus—Beyond that, beyond this,—there is indeed no object beyond. There is nothing which is by its nature, and by virtue of qualities, superior to Brahman—this (is) the sense, and of that Brahman, Satyasya Satyam is the name. And this is the explanation thereof—Prānas indeed are Satya, and of them, this (Paramātman is) Satya. By the word Prāṇa the Jīvas are referred to, on account of their company with the Prānas. They, for the matter of that, (are) Satya, on account of the absence of modification involving change of their nature like the sky etc.

Teṣāmeṣa Satyam—this highest Puruṣa is Satya, even beyond them. In the case of the Jīvas, contraction and expansion of knowledge in conformity with Karman, do exist. In the case of the highest Puruṣa, however, who is with all sins destroyed, those two do not exist. Therefore, this one is Satya, even beyond them. Hence, in this way, on account of the association with the host of qualities spoken of in the remaining part of the passage, Brahman being possessed of attributes, is not repudiated by (the passage)

'Not thus, not thus' (Br. 2·3·6)

but only the limit referred to before. Therefore, the Highest Brahman is possessed of both the characteristics. ॥ 21 ॥

[408] ब्रह्मणः प्रमाणान्तरागोचरत्वेन तत्संबन्धितया मूर्तामूर्तादिरूपानुवादेन तन्निषेधासंभवात्प्रकृतेयत्ताप्रतिषेध उक्तः, तदेव प्रमाणान्तरागोचरत्वं द्रढयति ।

तदव्यक्तमाह हि ॥ २२ ॥

तद्ब्रह्म प्रमाणान्तरेण न व्यज्यते । आह हि शास्त्रम्

' न संदृशे तिष्ठति रूपमस्य न चक्षुषा पश्यति कश्चनैनम् ।' (का. ६।९)

' न चक्षुषा गृह्यते नापि वाचा ' (मु. ३।२।८)

इत्यादि ॥ २२ ॥

हेत्वन्तरं चाह—

अपि संराधने प्रत्यक्षानुमानाभ्याम् ॥ २३ ॥

अपि च, संराधने सम्यक्प्रीणने, भक्तिरूपापन्ने निदिध्यासने, एवास्य साक्षात्कारो नान्यत्रेति श्रुतिस्मृतिभ्यामवगम्यते—

' नायमात्मा प्रवचनेन लभ्यो न मेधया न बहुना श्रुतेन ।
यमेवैष वृणुते तेन लभ्यस्तस्यैष आत्मा विवृणुते तनुं स्वाम् ॥'

(मु. ३।२।३)

---

[408] Because Brahman is not within the province of other means of proof, there is the impossibility of its repudiation, by the mention of its having a form and not having a form, being repeated, as being associated with it—and so, the repudiation is spoken of as confined to the limit which is the matter in hand. (The Sūtrakāra) corroborates that same—(i. e.) not being within the province of other means of proof—

For the Śāstra speaks of that as Unmanifest (by the means of proof) ॥ 22 ॥

That Brahman is not made manifest by other means of proof. For, the Sāstra (says)—

' His form cannot come within the range of sight; none sees this one by the eye '. (*Kā. 6·9*)

' Not by the eye is (it) grasped, nor even by speech ' (Mu. 3·2·8)

etc. ॥ 22 ॥

And (the Sūtrakāra) speaks of another reason—

And further in concentration, on account of the Śruti and the Smṛti ॥ 23 ॥

Api—and, Saṁrādhane—in proper propitiation, (i. e.) in con *templation attaining to the status of devotion;* verily, there is here direct realisation of this, not elsewhere. — This is known from the Śruti and the Smṛti —

' Not is this Ātman to be secured by lectures, nor by memory (intelligence), nor by abundant learning; whom only this one chooses, by him is he to be secured; for him this Ātman lays bare his body. ' (Mu. 3·2·3)

'ज्ञानप्रसादेन विशुद्धसत्त्वस्ततस्तु तं पश्यते निष्कलं ध्यायमानः ।'
(मु. ३।१।८)

इति श्रुतिः । स्मृतिरपि

'नाहं वेदैर्न तपसा न दानेन न चेज्यया' (गीता ११।५३)

'भक्त्या त्वनन्यया शक्य अहमेवंविधोऽर्जुन ।
ज्ञातुं द्रष्टुं च तत्त्वेन प्रवेष्टुं च परंतप ॥' (गीता ११।५४)

इति । भक्तिरूपापन्नमेवोपासनं संराधनम्, तस्य प्रीणनमिति पूर्वमेवोक्तम् । अतो निदिध्यासनाय ब्रह्मस्वरूपमुपदिशत्

'द्वे वाव ब्रह्मणः' (बृ. २।३।१)

इत्यादि शास्त्रं ब्रह्मणो मूर्तामूर्तरूपद्वयादिविशिष्टतां प्रागसिद्धां नानुवदितुं क्षमम् ॥ २३ ॥

प्रकाशादिवच्चावैशेष्यं प्रकाशश्च कर्मण्यभ्यासात् ॥ २४ ॥

[**409**] इतश्च प्रकृतैतावत्त्वमेव प्रतिषेधति, न मूर्तामूर्तादिविशिष्टत्वम् । यतः साक्षात्कृतपरब्रह्मस्वरूपाणां वामदेवादीनां दर्शने प्रकाशादिवज्ज्ञानानन्दादिस्वरूपवन्मूर्तामूर्तादिप्रपञ्चविशिष्टताया अपि ब्रह्मगुणत्वावैशेष्यं प्रतीयते

'He, with the purified Sattva quality by the favour of knowledge, and then contemplating upon (Him,) he sees Him without parts.' (Mu. 3·1·8)

— Thus the Śruti; the Smṛti also—

'Not I, by the Vedas, nor by penance, nor by giving gifts, nor again, by sacrificing' (Gītā 11·53)

'But, by whole-hearted devotion, I of such nature, (O) Arjuna, can be known and seen in reality, and also, entered into, (O) enemy-chastiser.' (Gītā 11·54)

Worship itself attaining to the status of devotion is Saṁrādhana — his propitiation — this has already been mentioned.. Therefore, the Śāstra-passage

'Two, indeed (the forms) of Brahman' (Br. 2·3·1)

etc., teaching the nature of Brahman for contemplation, is not competent to carry forward (repeat) the mention of Brahman being particularised by the two forms, Mūrta (incarnate) and Amūrta (formless) etc., not established before. ॥ 23 ॥

And, like light etc., no distinction; and light in the (Saṁrādhana-) act through practice. ॥ 24 ॥

[**409**] For this reason also, (the Śruti) repudiates only so much (limit) of the matter in hand, and not its being particularised by Mūrta and Amūrta (forms) etc, because in the realisation by Vāmadeva and others who directly realised the nature of the Highest Brahman, are apprehended the qualities of Brahman as not showing any particularity even in respect of being particularised by the worldly existence, material and formless states etc, like the nature of knowledge, of bliss etc, as in the case of light etc.—

'तद्धैतत्पश्यन्नृषिर्वामदेव प्रतिपेदेऽहं मनुरभवं सूर्यश्च' (बृ १।४।१०)

इत्यादि। ब्रह्मस्वरूपभूतप्रकाशानन्दादिश्च तेषां वामदेवादीनां संराधनात्मके कर्मण्यभ्यासादुपलभ्यते। तद्वच्चाभ्यस्तसंराधनानां तेषां मूर्तामूर्तादिविशिष्टत्वमप्यविशेषेण प्रतीयत इत्यर्थः ॥ २४ ॥

उक्तं ब्रह्मण उभयलिङ्गत्वमुपसंहरति—

अतोनन्तेन तथा हि लिङ्गम् ॥ २५ ॥

अत उक्तैर्हेतुभिर्ब्रह्मणोऽनन्तेन कल्याणगुणगणेन विशिष्टत्वं सिद्धम्। तथा हि सत्युभयलिङ्गं ब्रह्मोपपन्नं भवति ॥ २५ ॥

उभयलिङ्गाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (५)

उभयव्यपदेशात्त्वहिकुण्डलवत् ॥ २६ ॥

(अधिकरण ६, सूत्राणि २६–२९)

[410] मूर्तामूर्तात्मकस्याचित्प्रपञ्चस्य ब्रह्मणो रूपत्वम्

'द्वे वाव ब्रह्मणो रूपे' (बृ २।३।१)

इत्यादिनोपदिश्यते।

'अथात आदेशो नेति नेति' (बृ २।३।६)

'That verily, this — seeing (this), the sage Vamadeva realised — I have become Manu and the Sun (Br 1 4 10)

etc, And the light, bliss etc, that are the nature of Brahman are experienced in the practice of contemplation activity of Vāmadeva and others Like that, in the case of those, who have practised contemplation being particularised by (qualities) material formless etc, is also apprehended without distinction — This (is) the sense ॥ 24 ॥

(The Sūtrakāra now) winds up the topic — Brahman being possessed of both characteristics — under discussion —

Therefore, owing to (being) infinite, and in that way (possessed of both) the characteristics ॥ 25 ॥

Therefore, by the reasons mentioned it has been established that Brahman is particularised by an infinite host of auspicious qualities for (only) in that case Brahman as possessed of both the characteristics becomes appropriate ॥ 25 ॥

Here ends the Ubhayalingadhikarana (5)

But on account of reference to both, like the serpent and the coil ॥ 26 ॥

(Adhikarana 6 Sutras 26–29)

[410] Brahman being possessed of a form with the non sentient worldly existence consisting of the incarnate and formless is taught by

'Two, verily, (are) the forms of Brahman' (Br 2 3 1)

etc By (the passage)

'Now, the instruction — Not thus, not thus' (Br 2 3 6)

इति मूर्तामूर्ताचिद्वस्तुरूपतया ब्रह्मण इयत्ता प्रतिषिध्यते ।
'न ह्येतस्मादिति नेत्यन्यत्परमस्ति' (बृ. २।३।६)
इति, ब्रह्मणोऽन्यदुत्कृष्टं नास्तीति प्रतिपादितम् । तदुपपादनाय
'अथ नामधेयं सत्यस्य सत्यमिति प्राणा वै सत्यं तेषामेष सत्यम्' (बृ. २।३।६)
इति प्राणशब्दनिर्दिष्टेभ्यश्चेतनेभ्योऽप्येष सत्यमिति कदाचिदपि ज्ञानादिसंकोचाभावादुक्तम् । तथा
'प्रधानक्षेत्रज्ञपतिर्गुणेशः' (श्वे. ६।१६)
'पतिं विश्वस्यात्मेश्वरम्' (ना. १३।१)
'नित्यो नित्यानां चेतनश्चेतनानाम्' (श्वे. ६।१३)
इत्यादिश्रुतेश्चायमर्थोऽवगम्यते । तस्याचिद्वस्तुनो ब्रह्मरूपत्वप्रकार इदानीं चिन्त्यते, ब्रह्मणो निर्दोषत्वसिद्ध्यर्थम्—

किमस्याचिद्वस्तुनो ब्रह्मरूपत्वमहिकुण्डलन्यायेन, उत प्रभाप्रभावतोरिवैकजातियोगेन, उत जीवस्येव विशेषणविशेष्यतयांशांशिभावेन ? इति । इह स्थाप्यमानं विशेषणविशेष्यभावमङ्गीकृत्य

---

the limit of Brahman is repudiated as being possessed of the form of non-sentient entities and the material and formless; by (the passage)
'Not, indeed beyond' this, — not anything beyond exists' (Br. 2·3·6)
is propounded that there is nothing superior to Brahman. For logically arguing it out, by (the passage)
'Then the name — Satyasya satyam — (Truth of Truth) — Prāṇas (are), verily, Satya; of those this, Satya' (Br. 2·3·6)
is stated that this one is Satya beyond the sentient beings pointed out by the word Prāṇa, on account of the absence of the contraction of knowledge etc., at any time. And similarly, by the Śruti (passages)
'The Master of Pradhāna and the Ksetra-knower, the Lord of qualities' (Śve. 6·16)
'The Master of the universe, the Lord of Ātman' (Nā. 13·1)
'Eternal of the eternals, sentient of the sentients' (Śve. 6·13)
etc., is understood this sense. And now is being considered as to how that non-sentient thing is the mode of being the form of Brahman, to establish that Brahman is free from blemish—(The alternatives are)—

Is this non-sentient entity the form of Brahman in the manner of the serpent and the coil,—or, by the association with one and the same universal, as of the lustre and the lustrous — or, by the relation of the part and the whole, by the relation of the qualification and the qualified as in the case of Jiva himself? — Having admitted the relation of the qualification and the qualified that is being established here, in (the Sūtras)

'प्रकृतिश्च प्रतिज्ञादृष्टान्तानुपरोधात्' (ब्र. सू. १।४।२३)
'तदनन्यत्वमारम्भणशब्दादिभ्यः' (ब्र. सू. २।१।१५)

इत्यत्र सूक्ष्मचिदचिद्वस्तुविशिष्टाद्ब्रह्मणः स्थूलचिदचिद्विशिष्टस्योत्पत्तिरनन्यत्वं चोक्तम्। किं युक्तम्? अहिकुण्डलवत्, इति। कुतः? उभयव्यपदेशात्।

'ब्रह्मैवेदं सर्वम्' (नृ. ता. ५)
'आत्मैवेदं सर्वम्' (नृ. ता. ५)

इति तादात्म्यव्यपदेशात्,

'हन्ताहमिमास्तिस्रो देवता अनेन जीवेनात्मनानुप्रविश्य नामरूपे व्याकरवाणि' (छा. ६।३।२)

इति भेदव्यपदेशाच्चाहेः कुण्डलभावर्जुभाववत्तस्यैव ब्रह्मणः संस्थानविशेषा एवाचिद्वस्तूनि ॥ २६ ॥

प्रकाशाश्रयवद्वा तेजस्त्वात् ॥ २७ ॥

वाशब्दः पक्षव्यावृत्त्यर्थः। ब्रह्मस्वरूपस्यैवाचिद्रूपेणावस्थाने भेदश्रुतयो ब्रह्मणोऽपरिणामित्ववादिन्योऽपि बाधिता भवेयुः। अतो यथा तेजस्त्वेन प्रभातदाश्रययोर्भिन्नयोरपि

'*And the Prakṛti in conformity with the solemn declaration and the illustration*' (Bra. Sū. I. 4·23)

'*That (effect) not being different from that (cause) owing to the word Ārambhana etc.*' (Bra. Sū. II. 1·15)

it has been stated here, that from the Brahman qualified by the subtle sentient and non-sentient entities, there is the origination of something qualified by gross sentient and non-sentient (entities), and also the non-difference.—What (is) proper? Like the serpent and the coil. Whence? Ubhayavyapadeśāt—on account of the reference to both; on account of the reference to identity in

'*Brahman alone (is) all this*' (Nr. Tā. 5)
'*Ātman alone, all this*' (Nr. Tā. 5)

and on account of the reference to difference in

'*Goodness! Entering into these three deities with this Living Self, I would modify name and form*' (Chā. 6·3·2)

—like the state of coil, and the state of being straight, in the case of the serpent, the non-sentient entities are particular configurations of the same Brahman ॥ 26 ॥

But like light and its resort, owing to (their) being possessed of light ॥ 27 ॥

The word Vā is for the purpose of turning away the (above) view. If the nature of Brahman itself abides in the form of the non-sentient, the Śruti passages speaking of difference and also those speaking of the non-transformation of Brahman would be stultified; therefore, just as there is the identity of lustre and its resort, although different, on account of (both of them)

तादात्म्यम्, एवमचित्प्रपञ्चस्य ब्रह्मणो रूपत्वमित्यर्थः ॥ २७ ॥

पूर्ववद्वा ॥ २८ ॥

वाशब्दः पक्षद्वयव्यावृत्त्यर्थः। एकस्यैव द्रव्यस्यावस्थाविशेषयोगेऽपि ब्रह्मस्वरूपस्यैवाचिद्रूपत्वादुक्तदोषादनिर्मोक्षः।

अथ प्रभातदाश्रययोरिवाचिद्ब्रह्मणोर्ब्रह्मत्वजातियोगमात्रं विवक्षितम्—एवं तर्हि, अश्वत्वगोत्ववद्ब्रह्मापीश्वरे चिदचिद्वस्तुनोश्चानुवर्तमानं सामान्यमिति सकलश्रुतिस्मृतिव्यवहारविरोधः पूर्ववदेव।

'अंशो नानाव्यपदेशात्' (ब्र. सू. २।३।४२)

'प्रकाशादिवत्तु नैवं परः' (ब्र. सू. २।३।४५)

इति जीववत्पृथक्सिद्ध्यनर्हविशेषणत्वेनाचिद्वस्तुनो ब्रह्मांशत्वम्। विशिष्टवस्त्वेकदेशत्वेनाभेदव्यवहारो मुख्यः। विशेषणविशेष्ययोः स्वरूपस्वभावभेदेन भेदव्यवहारोऽपि मुख्यः। ब्रह्मणो निर्दोषत्वं च रक्षितम्। तदेवं प्रकाशजातिगुणशरीराणां मणिव्यक्तिगुण्यात्मनः पृथक्सिद्ध्यनर्हविशेषणतया यथांशत्वं तथेह जीवस्याचिद्वस्तुनश्च ब्रह्म प्रत्यंशत्वम् ॥ २८ ॥

---

being possessed of lustre, — thus Brahman has a form with the paraphernalia of the non-sentient ॥ 27 ॥

But as before. ॥ 28 ॥

The word Vā is for the purpose of excluding both the (above) views. Even though one and the same substance be associated with different states, the blemishes mentioned cannot be got rid of, on account of the nature of Brahman itself being non-sentient.

If (it be said that) what is intended here is that there is only the association with the genus Brahman-hood in the case of the non-sentient and Brahman, as in the case of the lustre and its resort — Well, then because like horseness and bullness, Brahman will also be a generality persisting in Īśvara and the sentient and the non-sentient entities, the contradiction with the statement (practice) in all the Srutis and the Smrtis, indeed, stands as before. Like the Jiva in (the Sūtras)—

'A portion, on account of the reference as many' (Bra. Sū. II. 3·42)

'But like light etc, not thus the Highest' (Bra. Sū. II. 3·45)

the non-sentient things are a portion of Brahman, because they are the qualification not fit to be separately established. The description of non-difference also is the main thing on account of that being the portion of a qualified thing. And the description of the difference also is the main thing on account of the difference in nature and form of the qualification and the qualified. (In this way), Brahman being void of blemish is also guarded (kept in tact). Therefore, in this way, just as light-generality, quality-body, being qualifications not fit to be separately established, are the portion (respectively) of gem-individual, object possessed of quality and Ātman, similarly here Jiva and the non-sentient objects are a portion in respect of Brahman. ॥ 28 ॥

प्रतिषेधाच्च ॥ २९ ॥

'स एष महानज आत्माजरोऽमरः' (बृ. ४।४।२५)

'नास्य जरयैतज्जीर्यति' (छा. ८।१।५)

इत्यादिभिर्ब्रह्मणोऽचिद्धर्मप्रतिषेधाच्च विशेषणविशेष्यत्वेनैवांशांशिभाव इत्यर्थः। अतः सूक्ष्मचिदचिद्वस्तुविशिष्टं कारणभूतं ब्रह्म स्थूलचिदचिद्वस्तुविशिष्टं कार्यभूतं ब्रह्मेति कारणात्कार्यस्यानन्यत्वं कारणभूतब्रह्मविज्ञानेन कार्यस्य ज्ञाततेत्यादि सर्वमुपपन्नम्। ब्रह्मणो निर्दोषत्वं च रक्षितम्। ब्रह्मणो निर्दोषत्वेन कल्याणगुणाकरत्वेन चोभयलिङ्गत्वमपि सिद्धम् ॥ २९ ॥

अहिकुण्डलाधिकरणं समाप्तम्। (६)

परमतः सेतून्मानसंबन्धभेदव्यपदेशेभ्यः ॥ ३० ॥

(अधिकरण ७, सूत्राणि ३०–३६)

[411] इदानीमस्मात्परस्माज्जगन्निमित्तोपादानरूपपरमकारणात्परब्रह्मणः परमपि किञ्चित्तत्त्वमस्तीति, कैश्चिद्धेत्वाभासैराशङ्क्य निराक्रियतेऽस्योपास्यस्य निर्दोषत्वानवधिकातिशयासंख्येयकल्याणगुणाकरत्वस्थेम्ने।

And on account of the repudiation ॥ 29 ॥

'He, this great unborn Ātman, ageless, immortal' (Br. 4·4·25)

'Not by the old age of this, this becomes old' (Chā. 8·1·5)

—And on account of the repudiation of non-sentient nature in the case of Brahman, by these etc., — that is to say, there is the relation of the part and the whole, by the relation itself of the qualification and the qualified. Therefore, Brahman is the cause particularised by subtle sentient and non-sentient entities; Brahman is the effect particularised by gross sentient and non-sentient entities—and so, there is the non-difference of the effect from the cause; by the knowledge of Brahman which is the cause, the effect is known, etc.,— all this is quite in order. And (thereby) the blemishless-ness of Brahman is guarded against. And owing to Brahman being void of blemish and owing to its being the mine of auspicious qualities, Brahman being possessed of both the characteristics also is established ॥ 29 ॥

Here ends the Ahikuṇḍalādhikaraṇa (6)

Something beyond (this) on account of reference to bridge, measure, connection and difference. ॥ 30 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 7, Sūtras 30–36)

[411] Now, having raised a doubt by several fallacious reasonings that there is some principle even beyond the Highest Brahman, this Highest, the highest Cause, constituted of the instrumental and the material causes of the world, — *that is being repudiated for the purpose of the firm establishment of* being free from blemish and being the mine of unlimited excessive, innumerable auspicious qualities, in the case of this object of worship (Brahman)—

तत्रेयमाशङ्का—यदिदं परं ब्रह्मोभयलिङ्गमेतस्मान्निखिलजगत्कारणात्परमपि किञ्चित्तत्त्वमस्ति — कथम्?

'अथ य आत्मा स सेतुर्विधृति' (छा ८।४।१)

इत्यस्य परस्य सेतुत्वव्यपदेशात्। सेतुशब्दस्य च लोके कूलान्तरप्राप्तिहेतौ प्रसिद्धेरितोऽन्यदनेन प्राप्यमस्तीति गम्यते। तथा

'एत सेतु तीर्त्वान्धः सन्ननन्धो भवति' (छा ८।४।२)

इति तरितव्यता चास्याभिधीयते, अतश्चान्यत्प्राप्यमस्ति। उन्मानव्यपदेशाच्च, उन्मितं परिमितमिदं परं ब्रह्म

'चतुष्पाद्ब्रह्म' (छा ३।१८।२)

'षोडशकलम्' (प्र. ६।१)

इत्युन्मानव्यपदेशात्। स चायमुन्मानव्यपदेशस्तेन सेतुना प्राप्यस्यानुन्मितस्यास्तित्वं द्योतयति। तथा संबन्धव्यपदेशश्च सेतुसेतुमतोः प्रापकत्वप्राप्यत्वलक्षणो दृश्यते

'अमृतस्य परं सेतुं दग्धेन्धनमिवानलम्।' (श्वे ६।१९)

'अमृतस्यैष सेतुः' (मु २।२।५)

There this (is) the doubt—What is this Highest Brahman possessed of both the characteristics — even beyond this, the cause of the entire world, there is some principle How? On account of this Highest being referred to as a bridge in

'Now, what this Ātman, he (is) the bridge, the support' (Chā. 8 4 1)

And on account of the word Setu being well-known in the world as the means of reaching the other bank, it is known that there is something to be reached by one, other than this In the same way, this one is mentioned as fit to be crossed over in (the passage)

'Having crossed over this bridge, one being blind becomes non-blind' (Chā. 8 4 2)

For this reason also, there is something else to be reached And on account of the reference to the measure — Unmita — measured (is) this Highest Brahman on account of the reference to a measure in (the passages) —

'Four footed (is) Brahman' (Chā. 3 18 2)

'Possessed of sixteen parts' (Pra 6 1)

— And that, this reference to the measure indicates the existence of something not measured and which is to be reached by that bridge. And likewise, the reference to the relation of the bridge and the thing to be reached by the bridge, is seen as characterised by the nature of one who leads and the nature of the thing to be reached, as in (the passages)—

'The highest bridge of the immortal, like fire with the fuel all burnt up' (Śve 6·19)

'This, the bridge of immortality' (Mu 2 2·5)

इति । अतश्च परात्परमस्ति । भेदेन च परात्परं व्यपदिश्यते

'परात्परं पुरुषमुपैति' (मु. ३।२।८)

'परात्परं यन्महतो महान्तम्' (ना. १।५)

इति च । तथा

'तेनेदं पूर्णं पुरुषेण सर्वम् ।
ततो यदुत्तरतरं तदरूपमनामयम् ।' (श्वे. ३।९-१०)

इति । अत एभ्यो हेतुभ्यः परस्माद्ब्रह्मणः परमपि किञ्चिदस्तीति गम्यत इति ॥ ३० ॥

[412] एवं प्राप्ते, अभिधीयते—

सामान्यात्तु ॥ ३१ ॥

तुशब्दः पक्षं व्यावर्तयति । यत्तावदुक्तं सेतुत्वव्यपदेशात्परात्परमस्तीति, तन्नोपपद्यते । न ह्ययमत्र किञ्चित्प्राप्यं प्रति सेतुरुच्यते,

'एषां लोकानामसंभेदाय' (छा. ८।४।१)

इति सेतुसामान्येन सर्वलोकासंकरत्वश्रुतेः । सिनोति—बध्नाति, स्वस्मिन्सर्वं चिदचिद्वस्तुजातमसंकीर्णमिति सेतुरुच्यते,

'एतं सेतुं तीर्त्वा' (छा. ८।४।२)

इति तरतिश्च प्राप्तिवचनो यथा वेदान्तं तरति, इति ॥ ३१ ॥

And therefore, there is the highest beyond (this) Highest. And something higher than the Highest is indicated separately in (the passages)

'*He goes to the highest Purusa beyond the high*' (Mu. 3·2·8)

'*The high beyond the high—what the great beyond the great*' (Nā· 1·5)

Likewise in

'*By that, all this is filled by the Purusa,*
'*And what is still further beyond that, that is the formless, free from disease.*' (Śve. 3·9—10)

Therefore, from these reasons, it is known that there is something even beyond the Highest Brahman ॥ 30 ॥

[**412**] This (prima-facie view) being reached, it is stated—

But on account of a general (description) ॥ **31** ॥

The word Tu (but) turns away the (above) view. What, for the matter of that, has been stated — there is something beyond the highest, on account of the reference to its being the bridge — that is not proper. Not indeed, is this bridge here spoken of as referring to something to be reached: on account of the Sruti (passage) speaking of the absence of the confusion of the various worlds by referring to it as a bridge in general in

'*For the non-encroachment (non-breaking) of these worlds*' (Chā. 8·4·1)

Sinoti, binds within: (Brahman) is called Setu as within it the entire aggregate of sentient and non-sentient entities, is not scattered pell-mell In (the passage)—

'*Having crossed over this bridge*' (Chā. 8·4·2)

(the word) Tarati is in the sense of reaching as in — He crosses over (becomes an expert in) the Vedānta ॥ 31 ॥

बुद्ध्यर्थः पादवत् ॥ ३२ ॥

योऽयं

'चतुष्पाद्ब्रह्म' (छा ३।१८।२)

'षोडशकलम्' (प्र ६।१)

'पादोऽस्य विश्वा भूतानि' (तै आ. ३।१०)

इत्युन्मानव्यपदेशः, स बुद्ध्यर्थः, उपासनार्थः ।

'सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म' (तै २।१)

इत्यादिभिर्जगत्कारणस्य ब्रह्मणोऽपरिच्छिन्नत्वावगमात्, स्वत उन्मितत्वासंभवात्। जगत्कारणत्वं हि तस्यैव श्रूयते

'तस्माद्वा एतस्मादात्मन आकाशः संभूतः' (तै २।१)

'सोऽकामयत बहु स्यां प्रजायेय' (तै २।६)

इति। अतो यथा

'वाक्पादः प्राणः पादश्चक्षुष्पादः' (छा. ३।१८।२)

इत्यादिना ब्रह्मणो वागादिपादव्यपदेश उपासनार्थः, एवमयमपि ॥ ३२ ॥

[413] स्वयमनुन्मितस्य कथमुपासनार्थतयाप्युन्मानसंभवः ?—तत्राह—

स्थानविशेषात्प्रकाशादिवत् ॥ ३३ ॥

For the sake of worship, as the foot ॥ 32 ॥

This reference to measure in

' *What this four-footed one, Brahman* ' (Cha 3 18 2)

' *Possessing sixteen parts* ' (Pra 6 1)

' *His one foot, all beings* ' (Tai Ā 3 10)

—that is (in respect) of Buddhi — for the sake of worship on account of the impossibility of Brahman being measured in its own nature, because Brahman which is the cause of the world is known to be unlimited from

' *Existence, Knowledge, Infinite Brahman* (Tai 2·1)

etc. For, that alone is known in the Sruti (passages) as the cause of the world,

' *From that, verily, from this Ātman, Ākāsa is originated* ' (Tai 2 1)

' *He desired — May I be many, may I procreate* ' (Tai 2 6)

Therefore, just as in (the passage)

' *Vāk, foot, Prāna, foot, eye foot* ' (Chā. 3·18 2)

etc, the reference to speech etc, as being the foot of Brahman, is for the purpose of worship, so also, this (reference is for the same) ॥ 32 ॥

[413] How can there be the possibility of a measure even for the sake of worship, in the case of something which is by itself immeasurable ?— There (the Sūtrakāra) says—

On account of the particular places, like light etc ॥ 33 ॥

प्रतिपन्नवागादिस्थानविशेषरूपोपाधिभेदात्तत्संबन्धितयोन्मितत्वानुसंधानं संभवति। यथा प्रकाशादेर्विततस्य वातायनघटादिस्थानभेदैः परिच्छिद्यानुसंधानसंभवः, इत्यर्थः ॥ ३३ ॥

उपपत्तेश्च ॥ ३४ ॥

यदुक्तम्—

'अमृतस्यैष सेतुः' (मु. २।२।५)

इति प्राप्यप्रापकसंबन्धव्यपदेशात्प्रापकात्परं प्राप्यमस्तीति—तन्न, प्राप्यस्य परमपुरुषस्य स्वप्राप्तौ स्वस्यैवोपायत्वोपपत्तेः।

'नायमात्मा प्रवचनेन लभ्यो न मेधया न बहुना श्रुतेन।
यमेवैष वृणुते तेन लभ्यस्तस्यैष आत्मा विवृणुते तनुं स्वाम्॥' (मु ३।२।३)

इति, अनन्योपायत्वश्रवणात् ॥ ३४ ॥

तथान्यप्रतिषेधात् ॥ ३५ ॥

[414] यत्पुनरुक्तम्—

'ततो यदुत्तरतरम्' (श्वे. ३।१०)
'परात्परं पुरुषम्' (मु. ३।२।८)
'अक्षरात्परतः परः' (मु. २।१।२)

इत्यादिभेदव्यपदेशात्परात्परमस्तीति—तन्नोपपद्यते, तत्रैव ततोऽन्यस्य परस्य प्रतिषेधात्,

---

On account of the difference of the limiting adjuncts of the nature of particular places, speech etc., that have been secured, there is possible the application of measure (to Brahman), on account of its connection with them. — Just as in the case of light etc., spread over, there is the possibility of application to objects limited by the difference in places, window, jar etc. ॥ 33 ॥

And on account of propriety ॥ 34 ॥

As to what has been stated—in (the passage)

'This, the bridge of immortality' (Mu. 2·2·5)

on account of the reference to the relation of something reached and something leading to it, there is something to be reached beyond what leads to it. — That (is) not (so), because it is proper that in the case of the highest Puruṣa who is to be reached, he alone should be the means to reach him, on account of the mention by the Śruti of no other means in

'This Ātman is not to be secured by lectures, nor by intelligence, nor by abundant learning; whom alone this one chooses, by him is he to be secured, to him this Ātman lays bare his body.'
॥ 34 ॥ (Mu. 3·2·3)

Similarly on account of the repudiation of the other. ॥ 35 ॥

[414] As to what again has been said that on account of the reference to difference etc., in

'What is further beyond that' (Śve. 310)
'The highest Puruṣa beyond the highest' (Mu. 3·2·8)
'The one beyond the imperishable highest' (Mu. 2·1·2)

there is something highest beyond the Highest. — That is not proper, because there itself there is the repudiation of any other beyond that, in (the passage)

'यस्मात्परं नापरमस्ति किञ्चित् ।
यस्मान्नाणीयो न ज्यायोऽस्ति कश्चिद् ॥' (श्वे. ३।९)

इति । यस्मादपरं परं नास्ति किञ्चित् । न केनापि प्रकारेण परमस्तीत्यर्थः । तथान्यत्रापि

'न ह्येतस्मादिति नेत्यन्यत्परमस्ति' (बृ. २।३।६)

इति नेति निर्दिष्टादेतस्माद्ब्रह्मणोऽन्यत्परं न ह्यस्तीत्यर्थः । तथा

'न तस्येशे कश्चन तस्य नाम महद्यशः ।' (ना. १।२)

इति । तद्धि जगदुपादानकारणतयानन्तरमुक्तम्

'सर्वे निमेषा जज्ञिरे विद्युतः पुरुषादधि ।' (ना. १।२)
'स आपः प्रदुघे उभे इमे' (ना. १।२)

इत्यादिना ।

'अद्भ्यः संभूतो हिरण्यगर्भ इत्यष्टौ ।' (ना. १।३)

इति च जगत्कारणं पुरुषमेनं प्रत्यभिज्ञापयति ।

'ततो यदुत्तरतरम्' (श्वे. ३।१०)

इति, किमुच्यते ? इति चेत्—पूर्वत्र

'वेदाहमेतं पुरुषं महान्तमादित्यवर्णं तमसः परस्तात् ।
तमेव विदित्वाति मृत्युमेति नान्यः पन्था विद्यतेऽयनाय ॥' (श्वे ३।८)

'Beyond which there is nothing else whatsoever, than whom there is no one smaller, nor greater either' (Śve. 3·9)

—Beyond which nothing else whatsoever exists — that is to say, nothing beyond in any manner whatsoever. Similarly, elsewhere also, in (the passage).

'Not indeed beyond this, not anything else exists beyond' (Br. 2·3·6)

— not, indeed, is there anything beyond this Brahman pointed out by Neti.— This (is) the sense. Similarly in (the passage)—

'No one is its controller; its name is Mahadyaśas' (Nā. 1·2)

— and that is later spoken of as being the material cause of the world in

'All the moments (blinkings) were produced from the lightning, Purusa' (Nā. 1·2)
'He milked the waters, both these.' (Nā. 1·2)

etc. And (the passage)

'Hiraṇyagarbha originated from waters — thus eight' (Nā. 1·3)

also, puts one in mind of this Puruṣa being the cause of the world. If (it be asked), — what is then stated in

'What is further beyond him' (Śve. 3·10)

— (The answer is) — Having taught earlier in (the passage)—

'I know this Purusa, great, of the lustre of the Sun, beyond Tamas; having known him alone, one transcends death; no other path (exists) for salvation' (Śve. 3·8)

इति परस्य ब्रह्मणो महापुरुषस्य वेदनमेवामृतत्वसाधनम्, नान्योऽमृतत्वस्य पन्था इत्युपदिश्य, तदुपपादनाय

'यस्मात्परं नापरमस्ति किञ्चिद्यस्मान्नाणीयो न ज्यायोऽस्ति कश्चित् ।
वृक्ष इव स्तब्धो दिवि तिष्ठत्येकस्तेनेदं पूर्णं पुरुषेण सर्वम् ॥' (श्वे. ३।९)

इति पुरुषस्य परतरत्वं तद्व्यतिरिक्तस्य परत्वासंभवं च प्रतिपाद्य,

'ततो यदुत्तरतरं तद्रूपमनामयम् ।
य एतद्विदुरमृतास्ते भवन्त्यथेतरे दुःखमेवापियन्ति ॥' (श्वे. ३।१०)

इति पूर्वोक्तमर्थं हेतुतो निगमयति—यदुत्तरतरं पुरुषतत्त्वं तदेवारूपमनामयम्, यतस्ततो ये तत्पुरुषतत्त्वं विदुस्त एवामृता भवन्ति, अथेतरे दुःखमेवापियन्तीति, अन्यथोपक्रमविरोधोऽनन्तरोक्तविरोधश्च ।

'परात्परं पुरुषमुपैति दिव्यम्' (मु ३।२।८)

इत्यपि पूर्वत्र

'अक्षरात्परतः परः' (मु. २।१।२)

इत्यक्षरादव्याकृतात्, यः परः समष्टिपुरुषस्तस्मात्परो योऽदृश्यत्वादिगुणकः सर्वज्ञः परमपुरुषः, स एवेहापि परात्परः, इति समष्टिपुरुषात्परत्वेनोच्यते ॥ ३५ ॥

—that the knowledge itself of the Highest Brahman, the great Puruṣa, is the means of immortality; there is no other path for immortality; and having propounded for reasoning out in

'Beyond whom, there is nothing else—no one, smaller or bigger exists; unmoving like a tree, he alone stays in heaven, — by that Puruṣa is this all full' (Śve. 3·9)

that the Puruṣa being higher and the impossibility of anything else being beyond that, (the Śruti) concludes the subject-matter mentioned before with reasons, in (the passage)

'What is still further beyond that, that (is) formless, free from disease; those who know this, they become immortal and the others go to misery alone.' (Śve. 3·10)

what the entity viz. Puruṣa, the higher, that alone (is) formless, free from disease; because, beyond that, those who know that entity viz. Puruṣa they alone become immortal and others go to misery alone, otherwise, there would be conflict with the introduction and conflict with what follows. Even in (the passage)—

'He reaches the shining Puruṣa, highest beyond the highest' (Mu. 3·2·8)

who is the cosmic Puruṣa beyond the imperishable Unmanifest described before in (the passage)—

'Highest beyond the imperishable' (Mu. 2·1·2)

one, who is beyond that, possessed of the qualities, invisibility etc., omniscient, the highest Puruṣa, — that same is here also spoken of as Parātpara (highest beyond the highest) as being beyond the highest cosmic Puruṣa ॥ 35 ॥

अनेन सर्वगतत्वमायामशब्दादिभ्यः ॥ ३६ ॥

अनेन ब्रह्मणा सर्वगतत्वं सर्वस्य जगतो व्याप्तत्वम्, आयामशब्दादिभ्यः—सर्वव्याप्तिवाचिशब्देभ्योऽवगम्यमानमस्मात्परं नास्तीत्यवगमयति । आयामशब्दस्तावत्

'तेनेदं पूर्णं पुरुषेण सर्वम्' (श्वे ३।९)

'यच्च किञ्चिज्जगत्यस्मिन्दृश्यते श्रूयतेऽपि वा ।
अन्तर्बहिश्च तत्सर्वं व्याप्य नारायणः स्थितः ॥' (ना ११।६)

'नित्यं विभुं सर्वगतं सुसूक्ष्मं यद्भूतयोनिं परिपश्यन्ति धीराः ।' (मु १।१।६)

इति । आदिशब्दात्

'ब्रह्मैवेदं सर्वम्' (नृ ता ५)

'आत्मैवेदं सर्वम्' (नृ ता ५)

इत्यादयो गृह्यन्ते । अत इदं परं ब्रह्मैव सर्वस्मात्परम् ॥ ३६ ॥

पराधिकरणं समाप्तम् (७)

फलमत उपपत्तेः ॥ ३७ ॥

(अधिकरण ८, सूत्राणि ३७–४०)

[415] उक्तमुपासिसिषोपजननार्थं जीवस्य सर्वावस्थासु सदोषत्वं प्राप्यस्य च परमपुरुषस्य निर्दोषत्वं कल्याणगुणाकरत्वं सर्वस्मात्परत्वं च । अतःपरमुपासनं विवक्षन्तु-

---

All being pervaded by this, on account of the word Āyāma (pervading) etc. ॥ 36 ॥

Anena—by Brahman, Sarvagatatvam—the whole world being pervaded. Āyāmaśabdādibhyah—from the words denoting the pervading of all —(Sarvagatatva) known from these, makes one comprehend that there is nothing beyond this — As to the Āyāma-Sabda, (there are the following passages)

'By that Purusa is this all full' (Śve 3 9)

'And whatever is seen or even heard in this world, inside and outside — having pervaded all that Nārāyana stays on' (Nā 11 6)

'Eternal, all-pervading, all-going, extremely subtle, what is the source of beings — the wise perceive all round' (Mu 1·1 6)

— By the word Ādi are (to be) taken (the passages)

'Brahman alone, all this' (Nr Tā 5)

'Ātman alone, all this' (Nr Tā 5)

etc Therefore, this Highest Brahman, itself is beyond all ॥ 36 ॥

Here ends the Parādhikarana (7)

The fruit from this, on account of reasonableness. ॥ 37 ॥

(Adhikarana 8, Sūtras 37–40)

[415] It has (already) been stated that the Jīva is in all the states, full of blemish and that the highest Purusa who is to be reached is free from blemish, that he is the mine of all auspicious qualities, and is beyond all, in order to produce a desire for worship. After this, now he (the Sūtrakāra)

पासीनानां परस्मादेवास्मात्पुरुषात्तत्प्राप्तिरूपमपवर्गाख्यं फलम्, इति संप्रति ब्रूते । तुल्यन्यायतया शास्त्रीयमैहिकमामुष्मिकमपि फलमत एव परस्मात्पुरुषाद्भवतीति, सामान्येन फलमत इत्युच्यते । कुत एतद् ? उपपत्तेः । स एव हि सर्वज्ञः सर्वशक्तिर्महोदारो यागदानहोमादिभिरुपासनेन चाराधितः, ऐहिकामुष्मिकं भोगजातं स्वस्वरूपावाप्तिरूपमपवर्गं च दातुमीष्टे । न ह्यचेतनं कर्म क्षणध्वंसि कालान्तरभाविफलसाधनं भवितुमर्हति ॥ ३७ ॥

श्रुतत्वाच्च ॥ ३८ ॥

'स वा एष महानज आत्मान्नादो वसुदानः' (बृ. ४।४।२४)
'एष ह्येवानन्दयाति' (तै. २।७)

इति भोगापवर्गरूपं फलमयमेव ददातीति हि श्रूयते ॥ ३८ ॥

[416] संप्रति पूर्वपक्षमाह—

धर्मं जैमिनिरत एव ॥ ३९ ॥

अत एव, उपपत्तेः शास्त्राच्च यागदानहोमोपासनरूपधर्ममेव फलप्रदं जैमिनिराचार्यो मन्यते । लोके हि कृष्यादिकं कर्म दानादिकं च कर्म, साक्षाद्वा परम्परया वा स्वयमेव फल-

---

desirous of describing the worship says that the fruit (of the worship) of the nature of reaching that (highest Pūruṣa), called salvation is from this highest Puruṣa alone, in the case of the worshippers. The fruit mentioned in the Śāstra, belonging to this world as well as to the hereafter comes from this very highest Puruṣa, owing to the situation being common (owing to the common state of things); and so, Phalamataḥ is spoken of in a general way. Whence this? On account of propriety; for, that same omniscient, all-powerful, extremely liberal one, when propitiated with sacrifices, gifts and oblations etc., and with the worship, is the master to dispense the aggregate of enjoyments belonging to this as well as to the other world—and salvation of the form of the attainment to his own nature. Not indeed does the non-sentient Karman perishing in a moment, deserve to become the means of the fruit that is to accrue after a lapse of time. ॥ 37 ॥

And on account of the mention in the Śruti ॥ 38 ॥

For, it is mentioned in the Śruti that this one alone gives the fruit of the nature of enjoyment and salvation—

'He, verily, this great unborn Ātman, the giver of food, the giver of wealth' (Bṛ. 4·4·24)
'This one alone causes delight' (Tai. 2·7)

॥ 38 ॥

[416] Now (the Sutrakāra states) the prima-facie view—

Dharma (says) Jaimini, for this very reason. ॥ 39 ॥

Ata eva—On account of the propriety and on account of the Śāstra, the preceptor Jaimini thinks that Dharma alone of the nature of sacrifices, gifts, oblations and worship is the giver of fruit: for, in the world, Karman such as an agricultural operation and Karman such as the giving of gifts etc., are seen to be the means of the fruit of their own accord, either directly or indirectly.

साधनं दृष्टम् । एवं वेदेऽपि यागदानहोमादीनां साक्षात्फलसाधनत्वाभावेऽपि परम्परयापूर्वद्वारेण फलसाधनत्वमुपपद्यते । तथा, यजेत स्वर्गकामः—इत्यादिशास्त्रमपि सिषाधयिषितस्वर्गस्य कर्तव्यतया यागाद्यभिदधत्, अन्यथानुपपत्त्या, अपूर्वद्वारेण फलसाधनत्वमेव गमयति ॥ ३९ ॥

पूर्वं तु बादरायणो हेतुव्यपदेशात् ॥ ४० ॥

[417] तुशब्दः पक्षव्यावृत्त्यर्थः । पूर्वोक्तं परमपुरुषस्यैव फलप्रदत्वं भगवान्बादरायणो मन्यते । कुतः ? हेतुव्यपदेशात् । यज देवपूजायाम्, इति देवताराधनभूतयागादावाराध्यभूताग्निवाय्वादिदेवतानामेव तत्तत्फलहेतुतया तस्मिंस्तस्मिन्नपि वाक्ये व्यपदेशात्

'वायव्यं श्वेतमालभेत भूतिकामो वायुर्वै क्षेपिष्ठा देवता वायुमेव स्वेन भागधेयेनोपधावति स एवैनं भूतिं गमयति' (तै. सं. २।१।१)

इत्यादिषु । कामिनः सिषाधयिषितफलसाधनत्वप्रकारोपदेशोऽपि विध्यपेक्षित एवेति, नातत्परत्वशङ्का युक्ता ।

एवमपेक्षितेऽपि फलसाधनत्वप्रकारे शब्दादेवावगते सति, तत्परित्यागमश्रुतापूर्वादि-

---

Thus, even in the Vedas, even though sacrifices, gifts, offerings etc., are not the direct means of the fruit, their being the means of the fruit indirectly through the Apūrva (Unseen) is appropriate. In the same way, the Śāstric passage—One desirous of heaven should sacrifice—etc., mentioning sacrifices etc. as fit to be performed by one desirous of accomplishing the heavenly world, does make one understand that it (Karman) alone is the means of the fruit through the Apūrva, it not being accounted for otherwise. ‖ 39 ‖

But, the former (says) Bādarāyaṇa, on account of the reference to the producing cause. ‖ 40 ‖

[417] The word Tu (but) is for turning away the (above) view. His Holiness Bādarāyaṇa thinks that the highest Puruṣa himself is the giver of fruit, as mentioned before. Whence? Hetuvyapadeśāt—because there is the reference even in the various passages, to the deities, fire, wind etc , alone that are to be propitiated in the sacrifices etc., that involve the worship of the deities in accordance with (the etymological meaning of) the root Yaj meaning —to worship the gods,—as being the producing cause in respect of the various fruits—

'One desirous of prosperity should slaughter the white (horse) to Vāyu (Wind)'—Vāyu, verily, is (the) swiftest deity. He runs to Vāyu himself, with his fortune. He alone makes this one attain to prosperity.' (Tai. Saṁ. 2·1·1)

etc. Inasmuch as the teaching also about the mode of being the means of the fruit desired to be accomplished, in the case of one longing for it, stands certainly in need of an injunction — thus the doubt about its referring to something else is not proper.

Thus, when the mode also about being the means of the fruit that is desired, is known from the word (of the Śruti) itself, persons honouring the means of proof do not tolerate abandoning that and fancying the Unseen, etc.,

परिकल्पनं च प्रामाणिका न सहन्ते । लिङ्गादयोऽपि देवताराधनभूतयागादेः प्रकृत्यर्थस्य कर्तृव्यापारसाध्यतां व्युत्पत्तिसिद्धां शब्दानुशासनानुमतामभिदधति, नान्यदलौकिकमिति प्रागेव, उक्तम् । तदेवम्

'वायुर्वै क्षेपिष्ठा देवता' (तै. सं. २।१।१)

इत्यादिशब्दाद्वाय्वादीनां फलप्रदत्वमवगम्यते । वाय्वाद्यात्मना च परमपुरुष एवाराध्यतया फलप्रदायित्वेन चावतिष्ठते, इति श्रूयते

'इष्टापूर्तं बहुधा जातं जायमानं विश्वं बिभर्ति भुवनस्य नाभिः ।
तदेवाग्निस्तद्वायुस्तत्सूर्यस्तदु चन्द्रमाः ॥' (ना. १।२)

इति । अन्तर्यामिब्राह्मणे च

'यो वायौ तिष्ठन्...यस्य वायुः शरीरम्' (बृ. ३।७।७)
'योऽग्नौ तिष्ठन्' (बृ. ३।७।५)
'य आदित्ये तिष्ठन्' (बृ. ३।७।९)

इत्यादि श्रूयते । स्मर्यते च

'यो यो यां यां तनुं भक्तः श्रद्धयार्चितुमिच्छति ।
तस्य तस्याचलां श्रद्धां तामेव विदधाम्यहम् ॥

---

not mentioned in the Śruti. It has already been stated that the injunctive mood etc., mention that the meaning of the root of Yāga (sacrifice) etc., which involves the worship of the deities, is to be accomplished by the operation of the agent, is proved by etymology and is favoured by the rules of grammar, and not anything else that is not mundane.—Thus in this way, from the Word (the Śruti)—

'Wind, verily, (is) the swiftest deity' (Tai. Sam. 2·1·1)

etc., Wind and others are known to be givers of fruit. And that the highest Puruṣa alone remains as the giver of fruit, being fit to be worshipped as he is the Ātman of Vāyu etc, is mentioned in the Śruti—

'He, the navel of the universe, supports sacrifices, pious deeds etc, the universe, produced or being produced in various ways—that same (is) Agni; that, Vāyu, that, the Sun; that, verily, the Moon.' (Nā. 1·2)

And in the *Brāhmana* passage dealing with the inner Controller, is mentioned in the Śruti—

'Who, abiding in Vāyu ..whose body (is) Vāyu' (Br. 3·7·7)
'Who, abiding in Agni' (Br. 3·7·5)
'Who, abiding in the Sun' (Br. 3·7·9)

etc. And it is mentioned in the Smṛti—

'Whosoever devotee, wishes to worship through faith, whatsoever form, I endow him with that necessary firm faith itself.

स तया श्रद्धया युक्तस्तस्याराधनमीहते ।
लभते च ततः कामान्मयैव विहितान् हि तान् ॥' (गीता ७।२१-२२)

इति ।

'अहं हि सर्वयज्ञानां भोक्ता च प्रभुरेव च' (गीता ९।२४)

इति । प्रभुरिति फलप्रदायीत्यर्थः ।

'देवान्देवयजो यान्ति मद्भक्ता यान्ति मामपि ।' (गीता ७।२३)
'यान्ति मद्याजिनोऽपि माम्' (गीता ९।२५)

इति च । लोके च कृष्यादिभिर्विचित्ररूपान्द्रव्यविशेषान्संपाद्य, ते राजानं भृत्यद्वारेण साक्षाद्वार्चयन्ति । अर्चितश्च राजा तत्तदर्चनानुगुणफलं च प्रयच्छन्दृश्यते । वेदास्त्वतिपतितसकलेतरप्रमाणसंभावनाभूमिं निरस्तसमस्ताविद्यादिदोषगन्धं स्वाभाविकानवधिकातिशयापरिमितोदारगुणसागरं पुरुषोत्तमं प्रतिपाद्य, तदाराधनरूपाणि च यागदानहोमात्मकानि, स्तुतिनमस्कारकीर्तनार्चनध्यानानि च तदाराधनानि, तदाराधितात्परस्मात्पुरुषाद्भोगापवर्गरूपं फलं च वदन्तीति सर्वं समञ्जसम् ॥ ४० ॥

फलाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (८)

इति श्रीभगवद्रामानुजविरचिते शारीरकमीमांसाभाष्ये तृतीयाध्यायस्य द्वितीयः पादः ॥ २ ॥

Endowed with that faith, he desires to propitiate that; and thereupon secures his longings, verily, prescribed by me alone.' (Gītā 7·21-22)

And

'For, I am the enjoyer of all sacrifices and the Lord (of them) as well.' (Gītā 9·24)

Prabhuh—the giver of fruit, that (is) the sense. And

'The worshippers of the gods go to the gods; my worshippers go to me alone' (Gītā 7·23)
'Those sacrificing unto me, also, go to me' (Gītā 9·25)

In the world also, (people) having secured particular objects of various forms by agricultural operations etc., worship the king by them through the servants, or directly. And the king, (thus) worshippad, is seen to be giving fruit in conformity with the kind of worship offered. But the Vedas having described the Puruṣottama who has transcended the possible jurisdiction of all other means of proof, who is with even the tinge of every blemish, Avidyā etc., removed, the ocean of natural, endless, excessive, unlimited, liberal qualities, speak of the (Karmans) constituted of the sacrifices, gifts, offerings, etc., taking the form of his worship, and (various kinds of) worship of him—praise, salutation, glorification, worship, meditation,—and the fruit of the nature of enjoyment and salvation from the highest Purusa worshipped by them—so, everything is reasonable. ॥ 40 ॥

Here ends the Phalādhikaraṇa (8)
Here ends the Second Quarter of the Third Chapter in the Commentary on the Śārīrakamīmāṃsā, composed by the Illustrious Revered Rāmānuja.

तृतीयाध्याये तृतीयः पादः।

सर्ववेदान्तप्रत्ययं चोदनाद्यविशेषात् ॥ १ ॥

(अधिकरण १, सूत्राणि १–५)

[418] उक्तं ब्रह्मोपासिपोपजननाय वक्तव्यं ब्रह्मणः फलदायितापर्यन्तम्। इदानीं ब्रह्मोपासनानां गुणोपसंहारविकल्पनिर्णयाय विद्याभेदाभेदचिन्ता प्रस्तूयते। प्रथमं तावदेकस्या वैश्वानरविद्यादिकाया अनेकशाखासु श्रूयमाणायाः किमेकविद्यात्वम्, उत विद्याभेदः? इति चिन्त्यते। अविशेषपुनःश्रवणस्य प्रकरणान्तरस्य च भेदकत्वाच्छाखान्तरे चोभयोरवर्जनीयत्वाद्विद्याभेद इति प्राप्तम्। अत एव

'तेषामेवैतां ब्रह्मविद्यां वदेत शिरोव्रतं विधिवद्यैस्तु चीर्णम्' (मु. ३।२।१०)

इति शिरोव्रतवतामाथर्वणिकानामेव विद्योपदेशनियम उपपद्यते। विद्यैक्ये हि विद्याङ्गस्य शिरोव्रतस्यान्येषामपि शाखिनां प्राप्तेर्नियमो नोपपद्यते।

Third Quarter of the Third Chapter

What is understood from all the Vedāntas, on account of the directive etc., being non-different ॥ 1 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 1, Sūtras 1–5)

[418] What had to be said for producing a desire to worship Brahman, right up to Brahman being the giver of fruit, has been (already) stated. Now, the discussion about the difference and non-difference of the Vidyās, *is mooted in the case of (the different kinds of) worships of Brahman,* for the purpose of deciding the optional inclusion of the qualities. First, for the matter of that, it is considered whether in the case of the same Vaiśvānara-Vidyā etc., being mentioned in the Śruti in various recensions, there is one Vidyā or different Vidyās. Because, the repeated mention in the Śruti without any difference and the context being different, make for difference, and because both these are unavoidable in another recension, there is the difference in the Vidyās — This (prima-facie view) is reached. For this very reason, the restriction regarding the teaching of the Vidyā is appropriate in the case of the students of the Atharvaveda alone, observing the vow of carrying the fire on the head, as (in the passage) —

'For them alone, one should expound this Brahmavidyā, by whom has been properly observed the vow of carrying the fire on the head.' (Mu. 3·2·10)

For, if the Vidyā was to be one, the Śirovrata, a factor of the Vidyā, would have to be accepted by students of other recensions as well — so, the restriction would not be appropriate.

एवं प्राप्ते, उच्यते—

सर्ववेदान्तप्रत्ययम्, एकमुपासनमिति। कुतः? चोदनाद्यविशेषात्। चोदना तावत्, उपासीत, विद्यात्, इत्येवंजातीयको धात्वर्थविशेषविधिः। आदिशब्देन

'एकं वा संयोगरूपचोदनाख्याविशेषात्' (जै. सू. २।४।९)

इति कर्मकाण्डशाखान्तराधिकरणसूत्रोक्ताः संयोगरूपाख्या गृह्यन्ते। एषां चोदनादीनामविशेषात्सैवेयं विद्येति शाखान्तरे प्रत्यभिज्ञायते। तथाहि — छान्दोग्यवाजसनेयकयोः

'वैश्वानरमुपास्ते' (छा. ५।११; श. ब्रा. १०।६।१।११)

इति चोदना तावदेकरूपा, विदिपर्यायस्योपासेर्निर्देशात्। वेद्यैकनिरूपणीयस्वरूपस्योपासनस्य वेद्यभूतवैश्वानरैक्याद्रूपमप्यविशिष्टम्। आख्या च वैश्वानरविद्येत्यविशिष्टा। फलसंयोगोऽप्युभयत्रापि ब्रह्मप्राप्तिरूपोऽविशिष्टः। अत एभिः प्रत्यभिज्ञानाच्छाखान्तरेऽपि विद्यैक्यम्॥ १॥

[419] यत्तूक्तम्— अविशेषपुनःश्रवणात्प्रकरणान्तराच्च विधेयभेदप्रतीतेर्न विद्यैक्यमिति, तदनुभाष्य परिहरति—

This (prima-facie view) being reached, it is stated (in reply)—

There is only one worship—what is understood from all Vedāntas. Whence? On account of the non-different directive etc. The directive, for the matter of that, is a special injunction involving the root-meaning as homogeneous with expressions like—one should worship, one should know—By the word Adi are to be understood (factors such as) the connection, form, and name mentioned in the Sūtras in the topics of other recensions of the Karmakāṇḍa, as in

'Or one, on account of the connection, form, directive, name, being non-different' (Jai. Sū. 2·4·9)

—on account of the directive etc., being non-different, it is recognised in another recension, that this is that same Vidyā Thus (to explain the same)—In the *Chāndogya* and the *Vājasaneyaka* recensions, the directive, for the matter of that, is the same—

'One worships the Vaiśvānara' (Chā. 5·11; Śa-Brā. 10·6·1·11)

on account of the use of the root Upās, the synonym of Vid. The form of the worship the nature of which is to be pointed out, as the one to be known, is also not different, on account of the oneness of Vaiśvānara, the object to be known And the name viz. Vaiśvānara-Vidyā is the same, The connection with the fruit of the form of reaching Brahman in even both is not different. Thus, on account of the recognition of these (indications), there is the oneness of Vidyā even in the other recension. ॥ 1 ॥

[419] As to what has been stated that because there is the mention once again without any difference, and there is a separate context, there is apprehended the difference of the object of injunction—and so, there is no oneness of the Vidyās—(the Sūtrakāra) refutes, having commented upon that—

भेदान्नेति चेदेकस्यामपि ॥ २ ॥

अविशेषपुनःश्रुत्या प्रकरणान्तराच्च विधेयभेदान्न विद्यैक्यमिति चेत्, एकस्यामपि विद्यायां प्रतिपत्तृभेदात्पुनःश्रुतिः प्रकरणान्तरं चोपपद्यते। यत्र ह्येकस्मिन्प्रतिपत्तरि पुनःश्रुतिः प्रकरणान्तरं च विद्यते, तत्रान्यथानुपपत्त्या विधेयभेदाद्विद्याभेदः। प्रतिपत्तृभेदे तु तत्प्रतिपत्त्यर्थतया पुनःश्रुत्याद्युपपत्तेस्तत्र न विधेयान्तरसंभवः ॥ २ ॥

[420] यच्चोक्तम्— शिरोव्रतवतामाथर्वणिकानामेव विद्योपदेशनियमदर्शनाद्विद्याभेदः प्रतीयत इति—अत्राह—

स्वाध्यायस्य तथात्वे हि समाचारेऽधिकाराच्च सववच्च तन्नियमः ॥३॥

नैतदस्ति शिरोव्रतोपदेशनियमदर्शनं विद्याभेदं द्योतयतीति, शिरोव्रतस्य विद्याङ्गत्वाभावात्। स्वाध्यायस्य तथात्वे हि तन्नियमः। स्वाध्यायस्य तथात्वसिद्ध्यर्थं तज्जन्यसंस्कारभाक्त्वसिद्ध्यर्थं हि शिरोव्रतोपदेशनियमो न विद्यायाः। कुत एतत्?

If (it be argued) No, on account of the difference — (we reply) — even in the case of one (Vidyā) ॥ 2 ॥

If it be argued that there is no sameness of the Vidyā on account of the difference of the object of injunction, owing to the mention in the Śruti again, of no difference, and the context being different — (we reply) — Even in the case of one and the same Vidyā, the mention again in the Śruti, the separate context — these are appropriate on account of the person learning that being different. For, where, the student being the same, there is the mention in the Śruti again, and a separate context, — there the thing being not capable of being accounted for otherwise, there is the difference of Vidyās, on account of the difference of the object enjoined. But, when the students are different, the mention in the Śruti again, etc.,being accounted for by serving the purpose of comprehension by them, there is no possibility of another to be enjoined ॥ 2 ॥

[420] As to what has been said that the difference of Vidyās is apprehended, on account of the existence of the teaching of the Vidyā being restricted only to the followers of the Atharvaveda observing the Śirovrata — here (the Sūtrakāra) says —

The study of one's own Veda is for that purpose, on account of the authority of the Samācāra, and like the Sava (offering), that restriction. ॥ 3 ॥

It is not that the existence of the restriction regarding the teaching about the Śirovrata points out to the difference in Vidyās, because the Śirovrata is not a part of the Vidyā; for, that is the rule only when the study of one's own Veda is like that (part of the Vidyā); for, the rule about the teaching of the Sirovrata is for making one's own Veda have that nature, and for the sake of making it fit for being the resort of impressions produced by it, and not for the Vidyā. Whence this? Because in

'नैतदचीर्णव्रतोऽधीते' (मु. ३।२।११)

इति तस्याध्ययनसंयोगात्। समाचारेऽधिकाराच्च — समाचाराख्ये ग्रन्थे इदमपि वेदव्रतत्वेन व्याख्यातमित्यतिदेशात्, तेषामेव

'एतां ब्रह्मविद्यां वदेत' (मु ३।२।१०)

वेदविद्यामित्यर्थः। सववच्च तन्नियमः — यथा हि सवहोमाः सप्तसूर्यादयः शतौदनपर्यन्ता आथर्वणिकैकाग्निसंबन्धिनस्तत्रैव भवन्ति न त्रेताग्निषु ॥ ३ ॥

दर्शयति च ॥ ४ ॥

दर्शयति च श्रुतिरुपासनस्य सर्ववेदान्तप्रत्ययत्वम्। तथाहि — छान्दोग्ये

'तस्मिन्यदन्तस्तदन्वेष्टव्यम्' (छा. ८।१।१)

इत्युक्त्वा

'किं तदत्र विद्यते यदन्वेष्टव्यम्' (छा ८।१।२)

इति प्रश्नपूर्वकमपहतपाप्मत्वादिगुणाष्टकविशिष्टः परमात्मा तस्मिन्नुपास्य इत्युक्तम्। तैत्तिरीयके तु छान्दोग्यस्थं प्रतिनिर्देशमुपजीव्य

'Not this, one who has not performed the rite learns' (Mu. 3·2·11)

that is connected with the study. Samācāre adhikāracca — in the work called Samācāra, this also is explained as being a vow for the study of the Veda — on account of this extention of the principle — to them only

'One should speak of this Brahma-Vidyā' (Mu. 3·2·10)

— that is to say, the Veda-Vidyā. Savavacca tanniyamah — Just as the Sava-offerings, beginning with the Saptasūrya upto the Śataudana belonging to the one fire kept by the followers of the Atharvaveda, are to be there alone, not in the three fires. ॥ 3 ॥

And (the Sruti) points out. ॥ 4 ॥

And the Śruti points out that the worship is apprehended from all the Vedānta passages — To explain the same — In the *Chāndogya*, having stated

'What is inside in that, that is to be searched for' (Chā. 8·1·1)

it has been stated, with the question preceding it

'What is that existing here which is to be searched for?' (Chā. 8·1·2)

that the Paramātman is to be worshipped therein, who is particularised by the eight qualities, being with sins destroyed, etc. And in the *Taittiriyaka* (*Upanisad*), having based its statement upon the corresponding reference in the *Chāndogya*, is mentioned the worship of the Paramātman particularised by the eight qualities —

'तत्रापि दहरं गगनं विशोकस्तस्मिन्यदन्तस्तदुपासितव्यम्'

(ना. १२।३)

इति गुणाष्टकविशिष्टस्य परमात्मन उपासनमुच्यते। तदुभयत्र विद्यैकत्वेन गुणोपसंहारादेवोपपद्यते ॥ ४ ॥

तदेवं शाखान्तराधिकरणन्यायसिद्धं विद्यैक्यं स्थिरीकृत्य तत्प्रयोजनमाह—

उपसंहारोऽर्थाभेदाद्विधिशेषवत्समाने च ॥ ५ ॥

एवं सर्ववेदान्तेषु समाने सत्युपासने वेदान्तान्तराम्नातानां गुणानां वेदान्तान्तर उपसंहारः कर्तव्यः। कुतः? विधिशेषवदर्थाभेदात्। यथैकस्मिन्वेदान्ते श्रुतौ वैश्वानरदहरादिविधिशेषो गुणस्तद्विद्यासंबन्धात्तदुपकाररूपप्रयोजनसिद्ध्यर्थमनुष्ठीयते, तथा वेदान्तान्तरोदितोऽपि तद्विद्यासंबन्धित्वेन तदुपकाराविशेषादुपसंहर्तव्य इत्यर्थः। च शब्दोऽवधारणे ॥ ५ ॥

सर्ववेदान्तप्रत्ययाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (१)

अन्यथात्वं शब्दादिति चेन्नाविशेषात् ॥ ६ ॥

(अधिकरण २, सूत्राणि ६–९)

[420A] एवं चोदनाद्यविशेषाद्विद्यैकत्वमेकत्वे च गुणोपसंहारः कर्तव्य इत्युक्तम्।

'There also, the Dahara sky, free from grief; what is inside in that, that is to be worshipped' (Nā. 12·3)

— (so) the Vidyā being the same in both, that is appropriate by the inclusion itself of the qualities. ॥ 4 ॥

Thus in this way, having firmly established the oneness of Vidyās proved by the maxim referring to the topic in another recension, (the Sūtrakāra) speaks of the purpose thereof —

Inclusion definitely on account of the subject-matter being the same, like the subsidiary matter of the injunction, (and the Upāsanā) being common ॥ 5 ॥

Thus the worship being the same in all Vedāntas, the inclusion has to be made in another Vedānta passage, of qualities mentioned in other Vedānta passages — Whence? On account of the identity of the subject-matter (the sense), like the subsidiary matter of the injunction. Just as the quality which is the subsidiary matter to the injunction referring to Vaiśvānara, Dahara etc., mentioned in one Vedānta, is put to use on account of its connection with the Vidyā, and for the sake of effecting the purpose of the form of its obligation; similarly (the guṇa) although mentioned in another Vedānta has got to be included, on account of its having connection with the Vidyā and on account of the non-distinction of its obligation. The word Ca is for emphasis. ॥ 5 ॥

Here ends the Sarvavedāntapratyayādhikaraṇa (1)

If (it be argued), being different on account of the Word, (we reply) — No, on account of the non-distinction ॥ 6 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 2, Sūtras 6–9)

[420A] Thus, on account of the sameness of directive etc., there is oneness of Vidyā, and in the case of oneness, the inclusion of the attributes ha

अतः परं काश्चन विद्या अधिकृत्य प्रत्यभिज्ञाहेतुभूतचोदनाद्यविशेषोऽस्ति न वेतीति निरूप्य निर्णीयते। अस्त्युद्गीथविद्या वाजिनां छन्दोगानां च। वाजिनां तावत्

'द्वया ह प्राजापत्या देवाश्चासुराश्च' (बृ. १।३।१)

इत्यारभ्य

'ते ह देवा ऊचुर्हन्तासुरान्यज्ञ उद्गीथेनात्ययाम' (बृ. १।३।१)

इत्युद्गीथेनासुरविध्वंसं प्रतिज्ञाय, उद्गीथे वागादिमनःपर्यन्तदृष्टावसुरैरभिभवमुक्त्वा

'अथ हेममासन्यं प्राणमूचुः' (बृ १।३।७)

इत्यादिनोद्गीथे प्राणदृष्ट्यासुरपराभवमुक्त्वा

'भवत्यात्मना परास्य द्विषन्भ्रातृव्यो भवति य एवं वेद' (बृ १।३।७)

इति शत्रुपराजयफलायोद्गीथे प्राणदृष्टिर्विहिता। एवं छन्दोगानामपि

'देवासुरा ह वै यत्र संयेतिरे' (छा १।२।१)

इत्यारभ्य

'तद्ध देवा उद्गीथमाजह्रुरनेनैनानभिभविष्याम:' (छा १।२।१)

इत्युद्गीथेनासुरपराभवं प्रतिज्ञाय, तद्वदेवोद्गीथे वागादिदृष्टौ दोषमभिधाय

---

to be effected — this has been stated (so far). Now, further referring to certain Vidyās, a decision is arrived at after having scrutinised — whether, there is non-difference of the directive etc., which are the cause of recognition, or not There is the Udgīthavidyā of the Vājasaneyins and the Chandogas In the case of the Vājins, for the matter of that, — beginning with

'Both indeed, the sons of Prajāpati, — the Devas and the Asuras' (Br. 1·3·1)

having made a solemn declaration about the destruction of the Asuras by the Udgītha and having mentioned the defeat by the Asuras on account of the superimposing of Vāk etc., up to the mind on the Udgītha, in

'The Devas, verily, said — Goodness! We shall be superceding the Asuras in the sacrifice by the Udgītha' (Br. 1·3 1)

—having spoken of the defeat of the Asuras by the superimposition of Prāna on the Udgītha, in

'Now they said to this Prāna in the mouth' (Br. 1·3 7)

etc., the superimposition upon the Udgītha, of the Prāna is enjoined for securing the fruit, the defeat of the enemies in

'He becomes powerful himself, and his hating enemy is defeated, who knows thus.' (Br. 1·3·7)

Thus, in the case of the Chandogas also, beginning with

'Where the Devas and Asuras, indeed, verily, came together (for fight)' (Chā 1 2·1)

having solemnly declared that they would defeat the Asuras by the Udgītha, in

'Then the Devas chanted the Udgītha — by this we will defeat these (Asuras)' (Chā 1·2·1)

likewise mentioning the blemish in the superimposition of Vāk etc., — and then having spoken of the defeat of the Asuras, by the superimposition of Prāna on the Udgītha,

'अथ ह य एवायं मुख्यः प्राणस्तमुद्गीथमुपासांचक्रिरे' (छा. १।२।७)

इत्यादिनोद्गीथे प्राणदृष्ट्यासुरपराभवमुक्त्वा

'यथाऽश्मानमाखणमृत्वा विध्वंसत एवं हैव स विध्वंसते य एवंविदि पापं कामयते' (छा. १।२।८)

इति शत्रुपराभवायोद्गीथे प्राणदृष्टिर्विहिता। वेदनविषयविधिप्रत्ययाश्रवणेऽपि फलसाधनत्वश्रवणाद्वेदनविषयो विधिः कल्प्यते। उद्गीथविद्यायाः क्रत्वर्थत्वेन क्रतुसाद्गुण्यफलत्वेऽप्यार्थवादिकमपि फलं तदविरुद्धं ग्राह्यमेवेति देवताधिकरणे (ब्र. सू. १।३।२५) प्रतिपादितम्।

[421] तत्र संशय्यते— किमत्र विद्यैक्यम्, उत न? इति। किं युक्तम्? विद्यैक्यमिति। कुतः? उभयत्रोद्गीथस्यैवाध्यस्तप्राणभावस्योपास्यत्वश्रवणाच्चोदनाद्यविशेषात्। फलसंयोगस्तावच्छत्रुपरिभवरूपो न विशिष्यते। रूपमप्यध्यस्तप्राणभावोद्गीथाख्योपास्यैक्यादविशिष्टम्। चोदना च विदिधात्वर्थगताविशिष्टा। आख्या चोद्गीथविद्येत्यविशिष्टा। अत्र राद्धान्तिच्छायया परिचोद्य परिहरति—अन्यथात्वं शब्दादिति चेन्नाविशेषादिति।

'Now indeed, who, verily, is this chief Prāṇa, they worshipped him, the Udgītha' (Chā. 1·2·7)

etc., in

'Just as he destroys the solid stone, he destroys him who desires evil in one who knows thus.' (Chā. 1·2·8)

the superimposition of Prāṇa on the Udgītha is enjoined for the defeat of the enemies. Although there is no mention of the injunction-termination referring to knowing, the injunction referring to knowing is presumed owing to the mention in the Sruti of its being the means of the fruit. Although the Udgītha-Vidyā has for its fruit something in conformity with the sacrifice as it is meant for the sacrifice, the fruit although mentioned in the glorificatory passages, but not opposed to it, has got to be accepted — this has been propounded in the Devatā topic. (Bra. Sū. I·3·25)

[421] There arises a doubt — Is there here the oneness of Vidyā, or not? What proper? Oneness of the Vidyā. Whence? Because the directive is the same in both cases, and Udgītha alone is mentioned as the object of worship with the nature of Prāṇa superimposed upon it. About the connection with the fruit, for the matter of that, viz. the defeat of the enemies, there is no difference. Regarding Rūpa (form) also, there is no distinction, on account of the object of worship being the same, known as Udgītha with the nature of Prāṇa superimposed on it. The injunction also is not different, associated with the sense of the root Vid. The name, Udgītha-Vidyā is also the same.—Here, having put forward the objector's view almost appearing like the final view, the Sūtrakāra refutes the same — 'If (it be argued), being different on account of the Word, (we reply) — No, on account of the non-distinction.

यदुक्तं विद्यैक्यमिति तन्नोपपद्यते, रूपभेदात्। रूपान्यथात्वं हि शब्दादेव प्रतीयते। वाजसनेयके हि

'अथ हेममासन्य प्राणमूचुस्त्व न उद्गायेति । तथेति तेभ्य एष प्राण उदगायत्'

(बृ १।३।७)

इत्युद्गानस्य कर्तरि प्राणदृष्ट्यासुरपराभवमुक्त्वा

'य एवं वेद' (बृ १।३।७)

इति कर्तर्येव प्राणदृष्टिरेवंशब्दादवगम्यते। छान्दोग्ये

'अथ ह य एवाय मुख्य प्राणस्तमुद्गीथमुपासाचक्रिरे' (छा १।२।७)

इत्युद्गानस्य कर्मण्युद्गीथे प्राणदृष्ट्यासुरपराभवमुक्त्वा

'य एवंविदि पाप कामयते' (छा. १।२।८)

इत्येवंशब्दात्कर्मण्येवोद्गीथे प्राणदृष्टिर्विहिता। अत एकत्र कर्तरि प्राणदृष्टिशब्दादन्यत्र कर्मणि प्राणदृष्टिशब्दाच्च रूपान्यथात्वं स्पष्टम्। रूपान्यथात्वे च विधेयभेदे सति केवलचोदनाद्यविशेषोऽकिञ्चित्कर इति विद्याभेद इति चेत्— तन्न, अविशेषात्। अविशेषेण ह्युभयत्रोद्गीथसाधनकः परपरिभव उपक्रमे प्रतीयते। वाजसनेयके

As to what has been said that there is oneness of the Vidyās, (our reply is) that is not proper, on account of the difference in form. The difference in the form is apprehended from the word itself. In the *Vajasaneyaka*, indeed,

'Then they said to this Prāna in the mouth—Sing on for us—All right (Prana said)—This Prāna sang for them' (Br 1·3 7)

—in this (passage), having spoken of the defeat of the Asuras by the superimposition of Prana upon the agent of singing from (the passage),

'He who knows thus' (Br. 1 3 7)

is apprehended from the word Evam, the superimposition of Prāna upon the agent alone In the *Chāndogya*, having spoken of the defeat of the Asuras by the superimposition of Prāna on the Udgītha, the topic of singing—in (the passage)

'Now indeed, who, verily, is this chief Prāna. they worshipped him, the Udgitha,' (Cha 1·2 7)

'One who desires evil in one who knows thus' (Chā 1·2 8)

—from the word Evam is enjoined the superimposition of Prāna, upon the Udgitha the subject-matter Therefore the difference in the form is quite clear on account of the word (of the Sruti) superimposing the Prāna upon the agent in one place, and the word superimposing the Prana upon the subject-matter in another —If there is the difference of object of injunction when there is the difference in form, the non-difference regarding the mere directive etc, is of no importance,—and so, there is the difference in the Vidyās—If (it is argued) thus, (we say)—No, on account of the non-distinction, without any distinction is apprehended in the introductory parts in both places, the defeat of the enemies with Udgitha as the means In the *Vājasaneyaka* in the introductory part is mentioned

'ते ह देवा ऊचुर्हन्तासुरान्यज्ञ उद्गीथेनात्ययाम' (बृ. १।३।१)

इत्युपक्रमे श्रूयते। छान्दोग्येऽपि

'तद् देवा उद्गीथमाजह्रुरनेनैनानभिहनिष्यामः' (छा. १।२।१)

इति। अत उपक्रमाविरोधाय

'तेभ्य एव प्राण उद्गायत्' (बृ. १।३।७)

इत्यध्यस्तप्राणभाव उद्गीथ उद्गानकर्मभूत एव पाकादिष्वोदनादिवत्सौकर्यातिशयविवक्षया कर्तृत्वेनोच्यते। अन्यथोपक्रमगत उद्गीथशब्दः कर्तरि लाक्षणिकः स्यात्। अतो विद्यैक्यम् ॥ ६ ॥

[422] इति प्राप्ते, प्रचक्ष्महे—

न वा प्रकरणभेदात्परोवरीयस्त्वादिवत् ॥ ७ ॥

न वेति पक्षं व्यावर्तयति। न चैतदस्ति यद्विद्यैक्यमिति। कुतः? प्रकरणभेदात्।

'ओमित्येतदक्षरमुद्गीथमुपासीत' (छा. १।१।१)

इति प्रकृतमुद्गीथावयवभूतं प्रणवं प्रस्तुत्यैतस्यैवाक्षरस्योपव्याख्यानं भवति।

'देवासुरा ह वै यत्र संयेतिरे' (छा. १।१।१०–१।२।१)

'The gods, verily, said — Goodness! We would put it over the Asuras in the sacrifice by the Udgītha' (Br. 1·3·1)

— In the *Chāndogya* also in

'Then indeed the gods sang the Udgītha — we shall destroy these by this' (Chā. 1·2·1)

— Therefore, in order that there should be no contradiction with the introductory part, in

'This Prāṇa sang for these' (Br. 1.3·7)

the Udgītha with the nature of Prāṇa superimposed upon it, although it is the subject of singing itself, is spoken of as the agent, in order to refer to the extreme ease, like the mention of Odana (rice) etc , referring to its cooking etc., (odanah pacyate). Otherwise, the word Udgītha mentioned in the introductory part would just be in a metaphorical sense. Therefore, there is the oneness of the Vidyās ॥ 6 ॥

[422] This (prima-facie view) being reached, we reply —

Not so, on account of the difference of the context, like the qualities, being high and low. ॥ 7 ॥

The expression Na vā turns away the objection. It is not that there is oneness of the Vidyās. Whence? On account of the difference of the context. In (the passage),

'One should worship the Udgītha as the syllable Om' (Chā. 1·1·1)

having praised the Praṇava (Om) the matter in hand, which is a part of the Udgītha, there follows an exposition of this same syllable — Beginning with

'Where the gods and the Asuras indeed, verily, clashed' (Chā. 1·1·10–1·2·1)

इत्यारभ्य

' अथ ह य एवायं मुख्यः प्राणस्तमुद्गीथमुपासांचक्रिरे '　　　(छा. १।२।७)

इत्युद्गीथावयवभूतप्रणवविषयमुपासनं छन्दोगा अधीयते । वाजिनस्तु तादृशप्राचीनप्रकरणाभावात्

' हन्तासुरान्यज्ञ उद्गीथेनात्ययाम '　　　(बृ. १।३।१)

इति कृत्स्नमुद्गीथं प्रस्तुत्य

' अथ हेममासन्यं प्राणमूचुस्त्वं न उद्गाय '　　　(बृ. १।३।७)

इत्यादि कृत्स्नोद्गीथविषयमधीयते । अतः प्रकरणभेदेन विधेयभेदः । विधेयभेदे च रूपभेद इति न विद्यैक्यम् ।

किं च

' अथ ह य एवायं मुख्यः प्राणस्तमुद्गीथमुपासांचक्रिरे '　　　(छा. १।२।७)

इति पूर्वमक्रृतोद्गीथावयवभूतः प्रणव एवाध्यस्तप्राणभावश्छन्दोगानामुपास्यः । वाजिनां तु कृत्स्नस्योद्गीथस्य कर्तोद्गाता प्राणदृष्ट्योपास्य इति ।

' अथ हेममासन्यं प्राणमूचुस्त्वं न उद्गायेति । तथेति तेभ्य एष प्राण उद्गायत् '　　　(बृ. १।३।७)

---

the Chandogas read

' Now indeed, who, verily, is this chief Prāna — him the Udgītha, they worshipped '　　　(Chā. 1·2·7)

about the worship referring to the Pranava, a part of the Udgītha. The Vājins, however, on account of the absence of such an earlier chapter, having praised the entire Udgītha in

' Goodness ! We would put it over the Asuras in the sacrifice by the Udgītha '　　　(Br. 1·3·1)

read concerning the entire Udgītha topic

' And then, they said to this Prāṇa in the mouth — Sing you for us '　　　(Br. 1·3·7)

etc. Thus, on account of the difference in the contexts, there is the difference of one enjoined; and on account of the difference of the one enjoined, there is the difference of form; — and so, there is no oneness of Vidyās.

Furthermore, the Pranava alone which is a part of the Udgītha, the matter in hand before, with the nature of Prāṇa superimposed upon it in (the passage)

' Now, indeed, who, verily, is this chief Prāna — him, the Udgītha, they worshipped '　　　(Chā. 1·2·7)

is the entity to be worshipped for the Chandogas. In the case of the Vājins, however, the singer, the agent of the entire Udgītha is the object of worship with the superimposition of Prāṇa.

Having pointed out the superimposition of Prāṇa upon the singer, in (the passage)

' Now, verily, they said to this Prāna in the mouth — Sing you for us — All right (Prāṇa said) — This Prāṇa sang for them. '　　　(Br. 1·3·7)

इत्युद्गातरि प्राणाध्यासं निर्दिश्य

'य एवं वेद' (बृ. १।३।७)

इत्युद्गातैवाध्यस्तप्राणभाव उपास्यो विधीयते । अतश्च रूपभेदः । न चोद्गातरुपास्ये विहिते

'उद्गीथेनात्ययाम' (बृ. १।३।१)

इत्याख्यायिकोपक्रमविरोधः शङ्कनीयः, उद्गातुरुपासन उद्गीथस्योद्गानकर्मभूतस्यावश्यापेक्षितत्वात्तस्यापि परपरिभवाख्यं फलं प्रति हेतुत्वात् । अतो रूपभेदाद्विद्याभेद इति चोदनाविशेषेऽपि न विद्यैक्यम् ।

-परोवरीयस्त्वादिवत्—यथैकस्यामेव शाखायामुद्गीथावयवभूते प्रणवे परमात्मदृष्टिविधानसाम्येऽपि हिरण्मयपुरुषदृष्टिविधानात्परोवरीयस्त्वादिगुणविशिष्टदृष्टिविधानमर्थान्तरभूतम् ॥ ७ ॥

संज्ञातश्चेत्तदुक्तमस्ति तु तदपि ॥ ८ ॥

- उद्गीथविद्येति संज्ञैक्यात्तद्विद्यैक्यमुक्तं चेत्, तत्संज्ञैक्यं विधेयभेदेऽप्यस्त्येव । यथाग्निहोत्रसंज्ञा नित्याग्निहोत्रे कुण्डपायिनामयनाग्निहोत्रे च । यथा चोद्गीथविद्येति छान्दोग्ये प्रथमप्रपाठकोदितासु बह्वीषु विद्यासु ॥ ८ ॥

---

it is enjoined in

'Who knows thus' (Br. 1·3·7)

that the singer himself, with the nature of Prāṇa superimposed is the object of *worship. Thus, there is the difference of form. Not, indeed, should it be doubted that there is the contradiction with the introductory part of the story* in

'We would put it over by the Udgītha' (Br. 1·3·1)

when the singer is prescribed as the object of worship; because, when worshipping the singer, the Udgītha which is the subject of singing has got *necessarily to be there, as it also is the cause of the fruit, viz. the defeat of the* enemies. Therefore, on account of the difference in form, there is the *difference of Vidyā — and so, even when the directive is the same, there is no oneness of Vidyā.*

Parovarīyastvādivat — Just as in one and the same recension, even though there is the similarity of injunction about the superimposition of the *Paramātman upon the Praṇava that is a part of the Udgītha; — on account of* the injunction about the superimposition of the Golden Puruṣa, the injunction *about the superimposition particularised by the qualities, being the best of the* eminent etc., is another matter ‖ 7 ‖

If that is said, on account of the name; that also, however, exists ‖ 8 ‖

If the oneness of the Vidyās is spoken of (by the objector) on account of the name Udgīthavidyā being the same,—(the answer is) that sameness of the name does exist even when there is a difference in the object of injunction. Just as the name Agnihotra refers to the permanent (daily) Agnihotra, and also to the Ayanāgnihotra of the Kuṇḍapāyins, and just as the name Udgīthavidyā applies to many Vidyās mentioned in the first chapter in the *Chāndogya.* ‖ 8 ‖

व्याप्तेश्च समञ्जसम् ॥ ९ ॥

छान्दोग्ये प्रथमप्रपाठके, उत्तरास्वपि विद्यासूद्गीथावयवस्य प्रणवस्य प्रथमप्रस्तुतस्योपास्यत्वेन व्याप्तेश्च, तन्मध्यगतस्य

'तद् देवा उद्गीथमाजह्रुः' (छा. १।२।१)

इत्युद्गीथशब्दस्य प्रणवविषयत्वमेव समञ्जसम् । अवयवे च समुदायशब्दः – पटो दग्धः – इत्यादिषु दृश्यते । अतश्चोद्गीथावयवभूतः प्रणव एवोद्गीथशब्दनिर्दिष्ट इति स एव प्राणदृष्ट्योपास्यश्छान्दोग्ये प्रतिपत्तव्यः । वाजसनेयके तु कृत्स्नोद्गीथविषय उद्गीथशब्द इति कृत्स्नोद्गीथस्य कर्तोद्गाता प्राणदृष्ट्योपास्य इति विद्यानानात्वं सिद्धम् ॥ ९ ॥

अन्यथात्वाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (२)

सर्वाभेदादन्यत्रेमे ॥ १० ॥

(अधिकरण ३, सू. १०)

[423] छान्दोग्यवाजसनेयकयोः प्राणविद्याम्नायते

'यो ह वै ज्येष्ठं च श्रेष्ठं च वेद ज्येष्ठश्च ह वै श्रेष्ठश्च भवति प्राणो वाव ज्येष्ठश्च श्रेष्ठश्च' (छा ५।१।१, बृ. ६।१।१)

And on account of the extention (to it, everything is) all right. ॥ 9 ॥

In the case of the subsequent Vidyās in the *Chāndogya* in the first chapter, Praṇava, a part of the Udgītha, which is first introduced, being extended as the object of worship, it is quite right that the word Udgītha that comes in the middle in (the passage)

'Then verily, the gods sang the Udgītha' (Chā. 1·2·1)

should be referring to Praṇava itself. And a word signifying an aggregate is seen to refer to a part in expressions like — Cloth is burnt. And so, because Praṇava alone, that is the part of Udgītha is indicated by the word Udgītha, that same as the object of worship through the superimposition of Prāṇa should be understood (as being referred to) in the *Chāndogya*. In the case of the *Vājasaneyaka*, however, the word Udgītha refers to the entire Udgītha, and so, the agent of the entire Udgītha, the singer is the object of worship through the superimposition of Prāṇa — and so, it is proved that the Vidyās are different ॥ 9 ॥

Here ends the Anyathātvādhikaraṇa (2)

On account of the non-difference everywhere, elsewhere these. ॥ 10 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 3, Sūtra 10)

[423] In the *Chāndogya* and the *Vājasaneyaka* (Upaniṣads) is cited the Prāṇavidyā in

'Who, indeed, verily, knows the eldest and the best,—he indeed, verily, becomes the eldest and the best (of his own people). Prāṇa, indeed, is the eldest and the best' (Chā. 5·1·1; Br. 6·1·1)

इत्यादि। तत्र ज्यैष्ठ्यश्रैष्ठ्यगुणकं प्राणमुपास्यं प्रतिपाद्य, वाक्चक्षुःश्रोत्रमनःसु वसिष्ठत्वप्रतिष्ठात्वसंपत्त्वायतनत्वाख्यान्गुणान्प्रतिपाद्य, वागादीनां देहस्य च प्राणायत्तस्थितित्वेन तदायत्ततत्तत्कार्यत्वेन च प्राणस्य श्रैष्ठ्यं प्रतिपाद्य, वागादिसंबन्धितया श्रुतान्वसिष्ठत्वादीन्गुणांश्च प्राणसंबन्धितया प्रतिपादयति। एवं छान्दोग्यवाजसनेयकयोर्ज्यैष्ठ्यश्रैष्ठ्यगुणको वसिष्ठत्वादिगुणकश्च प्राण उपास्यः प्रतिपाद्यते। कौषीतकिनां तु प्राणविद्यायां तथैव ज्यैष्ठ्यश्रैष्ठ्यगुणकः प्राण उपास्यः प्रतिपादितः, न पुनर्वसिष्ठत्वादयो वागादिसंबन्धिनो गुणाः प्राणसंबन्धितया प्रतिपादिताः।

तत्र संशयः—किमत्र विद्या भिद्यते, उत न? इति। किं युक्तम्? भिद्यत इति। कुतः? रूपभेदात्। यद्यप्युभयत्र प्राण एव ज्यैष्ठ्यश्रैष्ठ्यगुणक उपास्यः प्रतीयते, तथाप्येकत्र वसिष्ठत्वादिभिरपि गुणैर्युक्तः प्राण उपास्यः प्रतीयते, इतरत्र तु तद्विधुर इत्युपास्यरूपभेदाद्विद्याभेद इति प्राप्ते, ब्रूमः—सर्वाभेदादन्यत्रेमे। नात्र विद्याभेदः। अन्यत्र कौषीतकिनां प्राणविद्यायामपीमे वसिष्ठत्वादयो गुणा उपास्याः सन्ति। कुतः? सर्वाभेदात्—प्रतिज्ञातप्राणज्यैष्ठ्यश्रैष्ठ्योपपादनप्रकारस्य सर्वस्य तत्राप्यभेदात्। तथाहि—छन्दोगवाजसनेयिनां प्राणविद्यायाम्

---

etc. There, having propounded Prāṇa possessed of the attributes of being the eldest and being the best, as the object of worship; having propounded in the case of the tongue, eye, ear and mind, the attributes known as the utmost glory, stability, merging and being the resort; having propounded the superiority (eminent nature) of the Prāṇa because the tongue etc., and the body have their existence dependent upon Prāṇa, and because their various acts are dependent upon him (Prāṇa), (the passage) propounds the attributes, utmost glory etc., mentioned as being associated with the tongue etc., as being connected with Prāṇa. Thus in the *Chāndogya* and the *Vājasaneyaka* is propounded as object of worship, the Prāṇa possessed of the attributes, being the eldest and being the best, and the attributes utmost glory etc. But in the Prāṇavidyā of the Kauṣītakins, in the same way Prāṇa possessing the attributes, being the eldest and being the best, is propounded as the object of worship; but, are not propounded the attributes, utmost glory etc., connected with the tongue etc., as being connected with Prāna.

There (arises) a doubt—Is the Vidyā here different or not? What proper? Is different. Whence? On account of the difference in form. Although in both places, Prāṇa himself with the attributes of being the eldest and being the best, is apprehended as the object of worship; still in one place, Prāṇa is apprehended as the object of worship, endowed with the attributes, utmost glory etc., also; but elsewhere as bereft of them.—so, on account of the difference in form of the object of worship, there is the difference of Vidyā.—This (prima facie view) being reached, we reply—Sarvābhedādanyatreme, Here is no difference of Vidyā. Anyatra—in the Prāṇavidyā of the Kauṣītakins also; Ime—the attributes, utmost glory etc., are the objects of worship. Whence? Sarvābhedāt—on account of the non-difference there also of everything—the mode of justifying Prāṇa being the eldest and the best, that has been promised (to be proved). To explain the same—In the Prāṇa-vidyā of the students of the *Chāndogya* and the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*—

'एता ह वै देवता अहंश्रेयसि व्यूदिरे' (छा. ५।१।६)
'अहंश्रेयसे विवदमानाः' (बृ. ६।१।७)

इति चोपक्रम्य, वागाद्येकैकापक्रमणेऽन्येषां सप्राणानामिन्द्रियाणां शरीरस्य च स्थितिं तत्तत्कार्यं चाविकलं प्रतिपाद्य, प्राणोत्क्रमणे सर्वेषां विशरणमकार्यकरत्वं चाभिधाय, सर्वेषां प्राणाधीनस्थितित्वतदधीनकार्यत्वाभ्यां प्राणस्य ज्यैष्ठ्यमुपपादितम्। एवमुपपादितं वागादिकार्यस्य प्राणाधीनत्वम्

'अथ हैनं वागुवाच यदहं वसिष्ठास्मि त्वं तद्वसिष्ठोऽसि'
(छा. ५।१।१३, बृ. ६।१।१४)

इत्यादिना वागादिभिरनूद्यते। कौषीतकिनां प्राणविद्यायामपि प्राणज्यैष्ठ्यश्रैष्ठ्यप्रतिपादनाय वागादिषु वसिष्ठत्वादयः प्रतिपादिताः।

'अथ हेमा देवताः प्रजापतिं पितरमेत्याब्रुवन्को वै नः श्रेष्ठः'

इत्यादिना वागादिगता गुणा वागादयश्च देहश्च प्राणाधीन इति प्राणस्य ज्यैष्ठ्यमुपपादितम्। वागादिभिः स्वस्वगुणानां वसिष्ठत्वादीनां प्राणाधीनत्वानुवादमात्रं तु न कृतम्। नैतावता रूपभेदः। वागादीनां वसिष्ठत्वादिगुणान्वितानां प्राणाधीनकार्यत्वोपपादनेनैव प्राणस्य वागादिवसिष्ठत्वादिगुणहेतुत्वस्य सिद्धत्वात्। तदेव हि प्राणस्य वसिष्ठत्वादिगुणयोगित्वं यद्वागादि-

---

'*These indeed, verily, deities disputed about the pre-eminence*' (Chā. 5·1·6)
'*Disputing about the pre-eminence*' (Br. 6·1·7)

—having begun thus, and having propounded that on the departure of each one of them, Vāk etc., the other sense-organs along with the Prāṇa, and the body remained and their various functions remained unimpaired and having mentioned that on the departure of Prāṇa all became shattered (helpless), and incapable of functioning. Prāṇa being the eldest is reasoned out on the strength of all having their existence dependent upon Prāṇa and their functioning dependent upon that (Prāṇa). And the dependence of the functioning of Vāk etc. on Prāṇa, argued out thus is repeated by Vāk etc., in (the passage)—

'*Then indeed Vāk said unto him—In that I am the richest, you are (really) the richest therein.*' (Chā. 5·1·13 ; Br. 6·1·14)

In the Prāṇavidyā of the Kauṣītakins also, the attributes, being the richest etc., have been mentioned in connection with Vāk and others, for the sake of propounding Prāṇa being the eldest and the best. In (the passage)

'*Then, verily, these deities going to Prajāpati, their father, said—who, verily, is the best of us?*'

etc., Prāṇa being the eldest is argued out because the attributes belonging to Vāk etc., and the body are dependent upon Prāṇa. Only the repetition of the statement has not been made by Vāk and others, about their own attributes, being the richest etc., dependent upon Prāṇa. Not by so much (is) the difference in form; because it is established that Prāṇa is the cause of the attributes, being the richest etc., of Vāk etc., by the arguing out itself of Vāk etc., endowed with the attributes, being the richest etc., having their activity depended upon Prāṇa; and that same—what is the cause of Vāk etc., ... (... of) Prāṇa's bei[ng] associated with the

वसिष्ठत्वादिहेतुत्वम् । अतोऽत्रापि वसिष्ठत्वादिगुणयोगात्प्राणो ज्येष्ठः प्रतिपन्न इति नास्ति विद्याभेदः । प्राणविद्याङ्गविषयमन्यदपि निरूपणमनन्तरमेव करिष्यते ॥ १० ॥

सर्वाभेदाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (३)

[424] यथा प्राणस्य वसिष्ठत्वाद्यनुसंधानेन विना ज्यैष्ठ्यश्रैष्ठ्यानुसंधानानुपपत्तेरनुक्तानामपि वसिष्ठत्वादीनां कौषीतकिप्राणविद्यायां प्राप्तिस्तथा ब्रह्मस्वरूपानुसंधानं येर्गुणैर्विना नोपपद्यते ते ब्रह्मविद्यासु सर्वास्वनुसंधेयाः, इत्ययमर्थः प्रतिपाद्यते—

आनन्दादयः प्रधानस्य ॥ ११ ॥

(अधिकरण ४, सूत्राणि ११–१७)

अत्र ब्रह्मस्वरूपगुणानां सर्वासु परविद्यासूपसंहारोऽस्ति न वेति विचार्यते । अप्रकरणाधीतानामुपसंहारे प्रमाणाभावात्प्रकरणश्रुतानामेवोपसंहार इत्येवं प्राप्ते, ब्रूमः—

आनन्दादयः प्रधानस्य । अभेदादिति वर्तते । प्रधानस्य गुणिनो ब्रह्मणः सर्वेषूपासनेष्वभेदाद्गुण्यपृथक्भावाद्गुणानां सर्वत्रानन्दादयस्तद्गुणा उपसंहर्तव्याः ॥ ११ ॥

[425] एवं तर्हि, गुण्यपृथक्भावादेवानन्दादिवत्प्रियशिरस्त्वादयोऽपि

---

attributes, being the richest etc. Therefore, here also, on account of his association with the attributes, being the richest etc., Prāṇa is known as the eldest.—and so, there is no difference of Vidyā. Some other exposition referring to the accessories of the Prāṇavidyā would be made immediately. ॥ 10 ॥

Here ends the Sarvābhedādhikaraṇa (3)

[424] Just as, because association with (the attributes) being the eldest and being the best, of Prāṇa, could not be accounted for, without the association with being the richest etc, there was the acceptance in the Prāṇavidyā of the Kauṣitakins of (the attributes) being the richest etc., though not (specifically) mentioned; similarly, the attributes without which the continuing association of the nature of Brahman is not possible,—these should be associated with, *in all the Brahmavidyās—this matter is being propounded—*

Bliss etc., (on account of not being different) of the Principal ॥ 11 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 4, Sūtras 11–17)

Here it is being considered—Is there inclusion in all the Paravidyās, of the natural attributes of Brahman, or not? There being no authority for inclusion (of the attributes) not read in the (particular) context, there should be the inclusion only of those mentioned (in the Śruti) in the context —This (prima-facie view) being reached, we say (in reply)—

Ānandādayaḥ pradhānasya — the expression Abhedāt continues (here from the previous Sūtra)—Pradhānasya —of Brahman, the entity possessed of attributes; on account of the non-difference in all the Upāsanās, on account of the attributes not being different from the entity possessing those, everywhere its (Brahman's) attributes, bliss etc, are to be included. ॥ 11 ॥

[425] (The objector says) — Well, in that case, on account of the very fact that they are not separate from the entity possessing the attributes, *(the attributes) agreeable, the head etc, like bliss etc., in (the passage)*

'तस्य प्रियमेव शिरः' (तै. २।५)

इत्यादौ ब्रह्मगुणत्वेन श्रुताः सर्वत्र प्रसज्येरन्। नेत्याह—

प्रियशिरस्त्वाद्यप्राप्तिरुपचयापचयौ हि भेदे ॥ १२ ॥

ब्रह्मस्वरूपगुणानां प्राप्तावुच्यमानायां प्रियशिरस्त्वादीनामप्राप्तिः, तेषामब्रह्मगुणत्वात्। ब्रह्मणः पुरुषविधत्वरूपणमात्रान्तर्गतत्वात्प्रियशिरस्त्वादीनाम्। अन्यथा शिरःपक्षपुच्छाद्यवयवभेदे सति ब्रह्मणोऽप्युपचयापचयौ प्रसज्येयाताम्। तथा च सति

'सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म' (तै. २।१)

इत्यादि विरुध्यते ॥ १२ ॥

[426] नन्वेवमेव ब्रह्मसंबन्धिनामैश्वर्यगाम्भीर्यौदार्यकारुण्यादीनां गुणानामनन्तानां गुणपृथक्स्थितित्वमात्रेण तत्राश्रुतानामप्युपसंहारे सति सर्वे सर्वत्र प्रसज्येरन्। आनन्त्यादुपसंहाराशक्तिश्च। तत्राह—

इतरे त्वर्थसामान्यात् ॥ १३ ॥

तुशब्दश्चोद्यं व्यावर्तयति। इतरे त्वानन्दादयोऽर्थसामान्यात्सर्वत्रानुवर्तन्ते। ये

'For him, what is agreeable itself is the head' (Tai. 2·5)

etc., which are mentioned in the Sruti as the attributes of Brahman, would be perforce encroaching everywhere—No, says (the Sūtrakāra)—

The non-admittance of having agreeable, the head etc, because, increase and decrease, if difference. ॥ 12 ॥

When the admittance of the natural qualities of Brahman is being mentioned, the attributes—agreeable, the head etc., are not admitted, because they are not the attributes of Brahman, on account of (the attributes) agreeable, the head, etc., being included only within the identity-description of Brahman as a human being; otherwise, if there are different limbs such as head, side, tail etc., there would be the undesirable contingency of increase and decrease in the case of Brahman also. And in that case, (the passage);

'Existence, Knowledge, Infinite Brahman' (Tai. 2·1)

etc, would be contradicted ॥ 12 ॥

[426] I say (says the objector) — All (attributes) would be perforce encroaching everywhere, if there is the inclusion in this way itself, even of (attributes) though not mentioned in the Sruti, merely by their staying not apart from the entity possessing the attributes—endless attributes, connected with the Brahman itself, such as overlordship, unfathomable nature, generosity, mercy etc. And there is also the incapability of inclusion on account of their being endless.—There says (the Sūtrakāra) —

But others, on account of the similarity to the object. ॥ 13 ॥

The word Tu turns away the objection. Itare tu — bliss etc., persist everywhere, Arthasāmānyāt — on account of the similarity to the object—

त्वर्थसमाना अर्थस्वरूपनिरूपणधर्मत्वेनार्थप्रतीत्यनुबन्धिनस्तेऽर्थस्वरूपवत्सर्वत्रानुवर्तन्ते। ते च गुणाः सत्यज्ञानानन्दामलत्वादयः।

'यतो वा इमानि' (तै. ३।१)

इत्यादिना जगत्कारणतयोपलक्षितं ब्रह्म

'सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म' (तै. २।१)

'आनन्दो ब्रह्म' (तै. ३।६)

इत्यानन्दादिभिर्हि स्वरूपतो निरूप्यते। अत उपास्यब्रह्मस्वरूपावगमाय सर्वासु विद्यास्वानन्दादयोऽनुवर्तन्ते। ये तु निरूपितस्वरूपस्य ब्रह्मणः कारुण्यादयो गुणाः प्रतिपन्नास्तेषां गुण्यपृथक्स्थितित्वेऽपि प्रतीत्यनुबन्धित्वाभावाद्ये यत्र श्रुतास्ते तत्रोपसंहार्या इति निरवद्यम् ॥ १३ ॥

[427] यद्युपचयापचयप्रसङ्गात्प्रियशिरस्त्वादयो ब्रह्मणः पुरुषविधात्वनिरूपणमात्रार्था न तु ब्रह्मगुणाः, तर्ह्यतथारूपस्य ब्रह्मणस्तथात्वेन रूपणं किमर्थं क्रियते? अतथाभूतस्य हि तथात्वरूपणे केनचित्प्रयोजनेन भवितव्यम्। यथा

'आत्मानं रथिनं विद्धि' (का. ३।३)

इत्यादिनोपासकस्य तदुपकरणानां च रथिरथादित्वरूपणमुपासनोपकरणभूतशरीरेन्द्रियादिवशी-

---

But those that are similar to the object, and are closely concerned with the apprehension of the object, being possessed of the qualification pointing out to the nature of the object, — they persist everywhere, like the nature of the object. And those attributes are, existence, knowledge, bliss, spotlessness etc. The Brahman characterised as being the cause of the world in

'From what these' (Tai. 3·1)

etc., is indeed described in its nature by the (attributes) — bliss etc., in

'Existence, Knowledge, Infinite Brahman' (Tai· 2·1)

'Bliss, Brahman' (Tai. 3·6)

Therefore, for the apprehension of the nature of Brahman, the object of worship, the attributes bliss etc., persist in all the Vidyās. But the qualities, mercy etc., that are associated with Brahman whose nature is explained, although they do not exist as separate from their substratum, there is the absence of the continuing apprehension and therefore, wherever these (qualities) are mentioned in the Śruti, they should be included there—This is unobjectionable. ॥ 13 ॥

[427] (Now), if the attributes—agreeable, the head etc., are merely for the sake of describing Brahman as a human being, for fear of increase and decrease being attributed (to Brahman), but are not the attributes of Brahman,—then for what reason is Brahman which is not of that form, described as being that? For, surely there must be some reason or other in describing something not that, as that. As in (the passage)

'Know Ātman to be the warrior in the chariot' (Kā. 3·3)

etc., is stated that the (metaphorical) description as the warrior in the chariot and the chariot, of the worshipper and the means thereof, is given for the

करणार्थं क्रियत इत्युक्तम्। न चेह तथाविधं किञ्चित्प्रयोजनं दृश्यत इति बलाद्ब्रह्मगुणत्वं प्रिय शिरस्त्वादीनामभ्युपेत्यम्, तत्राह—

आध्यानाय प्रयोजनाभावात् ॥ १४ ॥

प्रयोजनान्तराभावादाध्यानायायं रूपणोपदेशः क्रियते। आध्यानमनुचिन्तनमुपासनमुच्यते।

'ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति परम्' (तै. २।१)

इत्यत्रोपदिष्टाध्यानरूपवेदनासिद्ध्ये ह्यानन्दमयब्रह्मप्रतिपत्त्यर्थमानन्दमयं ब्रह्म प्रियमोदादिरूपेण विभज्य शिरःपक्षादित्वेन रूपयित्वोपदिश्यते। यथा, अन्नमयः पुरुषोऽयं देहः शिरःपक्षादिभिः

'तस्येदमेव शिरः' (तै. २।१)

इत्यादिना बुद्धावारोप्यते, यथा च प्राणमयमनोमयविज्ञानमयाः

'तस्य प्राण एव शिरः' (तै. २।२)

इत्यादिना प्राणाद्यवयवैर्बुद्धावारोप्यन्ते, एवमेवैभ्योऽर्थान्तरभूतस्तदन्तरात्मानन्दमयोऽपि प्रियमोदादिभिरेकदेशैः शिरःप्रभृतित्वेन रूपितैराध्यानाय बुद्धावारोप्यते। एवमानन्दमयोपलक्षणत्वात्प्रियशिरस्त्वादीनां न सर्वदानन्दमयप्रतीतावनुवर्तन्ते ॥ १४ ॥

---

sake of controlling the body, the sense-organs etc., that are the means for the worship. Not again, is seen here some reason like that. Therefore, that the Priyaśirastva etc., are the attributes of Brahman, must compulsorily be admitted—There says (the Sūtrakāra)

For contemplation, on account of the absence of (any other) purpose. || 14 ||

On account of the absence of any other purpose, this metaphorical description is given for the sake of contemplation. Ādhyāna is said to be contemplation, worship. For, in order to accomplish the knowledge in the form of contemplation, taught here in (the passage)

'The knower of Brahman secures the Highest' (Tai. 2·1)

Brahman full of bliss is taught after being metaphorically described as head, sides etc., being divided in the form of agreeable, delight etc., for the sake of knowing Brahman to be full of bliss. Just as the Puruṣa constituted of food; this body, with the head, sides etc. is superimposed upon the Buddhi, in

'Of him, this same head' (Tai. 2·1)

etc., — and as in

'Of him Prāna himself, the head' (Tai. 2·2)

etc., those constituted of Prāna, constituted of mind, constituted of Vijñāna, are superimposed upon the Buddhi by the parts of Prāṇa etc.; exactly in the same manner their inmost Ātman, a different entity from these, the one although constituted of Bliss, is superimposed upon the Buddhi, for the sake of contemplation with agreeable, delight, etc., existing in a portion—being identified with head, etc. Thus, on account of Priyaśirastva etc, being the pointers to the Anandamaya, they do not always persist in the apprehension of the Ānandamaya. || 14 ||

आत्मशब्दाच्च ॥ १५ ॥

' अन्योऽन्तर आत्मानन्दमयः '　　　(तै २।५)

इत्यात्मशब्देन निर्देशादात्मनश्च शिरःपक्षपुच्छासंभवात्प्रियशिरस्त्वादयस्तस्य सुखप्रतिपत्त्यर्थं रूपणमात्रमिति गम्यते ॥ १५ ॥

ननु

' अन्योऽन्तर आत्मा प्राणमयः '　　　(तै २।५)

' अन्योऽन्तर आत्मा मनोमयः '　　　(तै. २।३)

इत्यात्मशब्दस्यानात्मस्वपि पूर्वं प्रयुक्तत्वात्

' अन्योऽन्तर आत्मानन्दमय. '　　　(तै २।५)

इत्यात्मशब्दस्यात्मविषयत्वं कथं निश्चीयते ? तत्राह—

आत्मगृहीतिरितरवदुत्तरात् ॥ १६ ॥

' अन्योऽन्तर आत्मानन्दमय '　　　(तै २।५)

इत्यत्रात्मशब्देन परमात्मन एव ग्रहणम् । इतरवत् । यथेतरत्र

' आत्मा वा इदमेक एवाग्र आसीद् । ...स ऐक्षत लोकान्नु सृजे '

(ऐ. १।१)

इत्यादिष्वात्मशब्देन परमात्मन एव ग्रहणं तद्वत् । कुत एतत् ? उत्तरात्—

And on account of the word Ātman ॥ **15** ॥

Because in (the passage)

'Another inside, Ātman abounding in bliss'　　　(Tai. 2 5)

(the Ānandamaya) is pointed out by the word Ātman and because there is the impossibility of having head, sides, tail, etc , in the case of Ātman, it is known that (the attributes) Priyaśirastva etc , are a mere metaphorical description *for the easy apprehension of the same. ॥ 15 ॥*

I say (says the objector)— If in

'Another inside, Ātman constituted of Prāna'　　　(Tai 2 5)

'Another inside, Ātman constituted of mind'　　　(Tai. 2·3)

the word Ātman has been used before in respect of even the non-Ātmans — how can it be ascertained that the word Ātman in (the passage)

'Another inside, Ātman abounding in bliss'　　　(Tai 2·5)

refers to the Ātman ? — There says (the Sūtrakāra)—

The apprehension of the Ātman as elsewhere, on account of the next passage ॥ **16** ॥

By the word Ātman in (the passage)

'Another inside, Ātman abounding in bliss'　　　(Tai. 2·5)

the Paramātman alone is to be understood, — Itaravat—as elsewhere. Just as elsewhere, in (the passage)

'Ātman, verily, this one alone, was at the beginning . . He reflected — may I indeed create the worlds'　　　(Ai 1·1)

etc , there is the apprehension of the Paramātman himself by the word Ātman — like that Whence this ? Uttarāt — from the next passage referring to the Anandamaya,

'सोऽकामयत बहु स्यां प्रजायेय' (तै. ३।६)

इत्यानन्दमयविषयादुत्तराद्वाक्यात् ॥ १६ ॥

अन्वयादिति चेत्स्यादवधारणात् ॥ १७ ॥

[428] पूर्वत्र प्राणमयादिष्वनात्मस्वात्मशब्दान्वयदर्शनान्नोत्तरान्निश्चेतुं शक्यते, इति चेत्—स्यादवधारणात्। स्यादेव निश्चयः। कुतः? अवधारणात्। पूर्वत्रापि

'तस्माद्वा एतस्मादात्मन आकाशः संभूतः' (तै. ३।१)

इति परमात्मन एव बुद्ध्यावधारितत्वादन्नमयादन्तरे प्राणमये प्रथमं परमात्मबुद्धिरवतीर्णा, तदनन्तरं च प्राणमयादन्तरे मनोमये, ततो विज्ञानमये, तत आनन्दमये प्रक्रान्ता परमात्मबुद्धिस्तदन्तराभावादुत्तराच्च

'सोऽकामयत' (तै. ३।६)

इति वाक्यात्प्रतिष्ठितेत्युपक्रमेऽप्यपरमात्मनि परमात्मबुद्ध्यात्मशब्दान्वय इति निरवद्यम् ॥१७॥

आनन्दाद्यधिकरणं समाप्तम् (४)

कार्याख्यानादपूर्वम् ॥ १८ ॥ (अधिकरण ५, सू. १८)

'He desired — may I be many, may I procreate' (Tai. 2.6) ॥ 16 ॥

If it be objected, on account of the continued association, (the answer is)—it is so, on account of the definite ascertainment. ॥ 17 ॥

[428] If (it be argued) that it is not possible from the next (passage) on account of the word Atman being seen to be associated with the Prāṇamaya etc., the Anātmans, in the previous passages — to conclude (as you have done) — (We reply) Syādavadhāraṇāt — Syāt — There is definitely the conclusion. Whence? Avadhāraṇāt — From the ascertainment. Because previously also in (the passage),

'From that, verily, this Ātman, Ākāśa is originated' (Tai. 2·1)

—the Paramātman alone is ascertained in the mind; so, first the notion about the Paramātman came to be associated with the Prāṇamaya inside the Annamaya; then with the Manomaya inside the Prāṇamaya; then with the Vijñānamaya. Thence, the Paramātman-notion, transferred over to the Anandamaya became stabilised on account of the absence of anything inside it (the Ānandamaya) and from the next passage

'He desired' (Tai. 2·6)

— and so, there is the continued association of the word Atman referring to the Paramātman-notion in respect of the non-Paramātman even in the introduction, and so (everything is) flawless ॥ 17 ॥

Here ends the Ānandādyadhikarana (4)

On account of the statement of what is to be done, the new thing ॥ 18 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 5, Sūtra 18)

[429] पूर्वप्रस्तुतप्राणविद्याशेषभूतमिदानीं चिन्त्यते — छान्दोग्यवाजसनेयकयो-र्ज्येष्ठं श्रेष्ठं च प्राणमुपास्यमुक्त्वा प्राणस्य वासस्त्वेनापोऽभिधीयन्ते। छान्दोग्ये तावत्

'स होवाच किं मे वासो भविष्यतीत्याप इति होचुस्तस्माद्वा एतदशिष्यन्तः पुरस्ताच्चोपरिष्टाच्चाद्भिः परिदधति लम्भुको ह वासो भवत्यनग्नो भवति'

(छा. ५।२।२)

इति। वाजसनेयके

'किं मे वासः' (बृ. ६।१।१४)

इति प्राणेन पृष्टा वागादय ऊचुः

'आपो वासः इति' (बृ. ६।१।१४)

'तद्विद्वांसः श्रोत्रिया अशिष्यन्त आचामन्त्यशित्वा चाचामन्ति। एतमेव तदनमनग्नं कुर्वन्तो मन्यन्ते' (बृ. ६।१।१४)

'तस्मादेवंविदशिष्यन्नाचामेदशित्वा चाचामेदेतमेव तदनमनग्नं कुरुते'

(श. ब्रा. १४।९।२।१५)

इति। तत्र संशयः—किमत्राचमनं विधीयते, उतापां प्राणवासस्त्वानुसंधानम्? इति।

---

[429] Now is being considered what is the subsidiary (remainder) to the Prāṇavidyā introduced before. In the *Chāndogya* and the *Vājasaneyaka* passages, having spoken of Prāna, the eldest and the best as the object of worship, waters are mentioned as being the garment of Prāṇa — In the *Chāndogya*, for the matter of that,

'He, verily, said—What would be my garment? They said—waters. Therefore, verily, the persons desirous of eating this, envelope him (Prāṇa) with waters before and after. Thereby he secures a garment, becomes non-naked'. (Chā. 5·2·2)

In the *Vājasaneyaka*,

'Which (is) my garment?' (Br. 6·1·14)

— asked by Prāna thus, Vāk, etc., said

'Waters, garment.' (Br. 6·1·14)

'Brāhmaṇas knowing that, well-versed in the Vedas, desirous of eating, sip water, and having eaten, sip water; thereby they think that they are making this one, Prāṇa himself, not naked' (Br. 6·1·14)

'Therefore, one knowing thus, about to eat, should sip water, after eating, should sip water. Thereby, he makes this Prāṇa himself not naked'. (Śa. Brā. 14·9·2·15)

There (arises) the doubt — Is here sipping of water enjoined or is there a continued idea of waters being the garment of Prāṇa? Because there is the use (mention) of the optative termination in respect of sipping, in

'अशिष्यन्नाचामेदशित्वा चाचामेत्' (श. ब्रा. १४।९।२।१५)

इत्याचमने विधिप्रत्ययश्रवणात्

'एतमेव तदनमनग्नं कुरुते' (श. ब्रा. १४।९।२।१५)

इति चेदने विधिप्रत्ययाभावादनग्नतासंकीर्तनस्य स्तुत्यर्थतयान्वयोपपत्तेश्च भोजनाङ्गस्याचमनस्य स्मृत्याचारप्राप्तत्वेन विधिप्रत्ययबलात्प्राणविद्याङ्गमाचमनान्तरं विधीयते—

[430] इति प्राप्ते, ब्रूमः—आचमनीयानामपां प्राणस्य वासस्त्वानुसंधानमेवेहापूर्वमप्राप्तं विधीयते। कार्याख्यानात्—अप्राप्ताख्यानात्। अप्राप्ताख्याने शास्त्रस्यार्थवत्त्वादित्यर्थः। एतदुक्तं भवति—

'किं मे वासः। आपो वासः।' (छा. ५।२।२, बृ ६।१।१४)

'अद्भिः परिदधति' (छा. ५।२।२)

'एतमेव तदनमनग्नं कुरुते' (श. ब्रा. १४।९।२।१५)

इत्युपक्रमोपसंहारयोर्वाक्यस्यापां प्राणवासोदृष्टिपरत्वप्रतीतिः, आचमनस्य स्मृत्याचारप्राप्तत्वादाचमनमनूद्य, आचमनीयास्वप्सु प्राणवासस्त्वानुसंधानं विधीयत इति। अत एव छान्दोग्ये

'About to eat, he should sip water (Ācāmet); after eating also, should sip water' (Ś. B. 14·9·2·15)

and because there is the absence of the optative termination in respect of knowledge in (the passage)

'Thereby, he makes that Prāṇa himself non-naked' (Ś. B. 14·9·2·15)

and because the mention about the non-naked state can be justified as being associated with it, being intended for glorification, there is a mention of another sipping of water which forms a part of Prāṇavidyā, on the strength of the optative termination, the sipping of water forming a part of the meal, becomes incumbent on account of the Smṛti and the code of conduct.—

[430] This (prima-facie view) being reached, we say (in reply)—It is the continued idea itself of the waters to be sipped being the garment of Prāṇa, which is enjoined here, the Apūrva (a new thing) not secured before. Kāryākhyānāt—on account of the statement about what has not been there; on account of the Śāstra being significant only in mentioning things not secured before—this (is) the sense. This is what is intended to be said—

On account of the apprehension that the passages in the introductory and the concluding portions—

'Which, my garment? Waters, garment' (Chā. 5·2·2; Bṛ. 6·1·14)

'He envelopes by the waters' (Chā. 5·2·2)

'Thereby, he makes this Prāṇa himself non-naked' (Śa·Brā. 14·9·2·15)

as looking upon waters as the garment of Prāṇa, having merely repeated the sipping of water, which is to be practised on account of the Smṛti, and the *code of conduct*, the continued idea of the waters when *being* sipped

'तस्माद्वा एतदशिष्यन्तः पुरस्ताच्चोपरिष्टाच्चाद्भिः परिदधति' (छा ५।२।२)

इत्यद्भिः परिधानमेवोक्तं नाचमनम् ॥ १८ ॥

कार्याख्यानाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (५)

समान एवं चाभेदात् ॥ १९ ॥

(अधिकरण ६, सू. १९)

[431] वाजसनेयकेऽग्निरहस्ये शाण्डिल्यविद्याम्नाता

'सत्यं ब्रह्मेत्युपासीत । अथ खलु क्रतुमयोऽयं पुरुषः' (श. ब्रा. १०।६।३।१)

इत्यारभ्य

'स आत्मानमुपासीत मनोमयं प्राणशरीरं भारूपं सत्यसंकल्पमाकाशात्मानम्'
(श ब्रा १०।६।३।२)

इति । तथा, तस्मिन्नेव बृहदारण्यके पुनरपि शाण्डिल्यविद्याम्नायते

'मनोमयोऽयं पुरुषो भाः सत्यं तस्मिन्नन्तर्हृदये यथा व्रीहिर्वा यवो वा स एष सर्वस्य वशी सर्वस्येशानः सर्वस्याधिपतिः सर्वमिदं प्रशास्ति यदिदं किं च'
(बृ ५।६।१)

इति ।

---

as being the garment of Prāna is enjoined For this very reason, in the *Chāndogya* in

'Therefore indeed, people about to eat here, envelope (the food) with the waters, both before and after' (Cha 5 2 2)

is mentioned the enveloping (putting on a dress) by the waters and not the sipping ‖ 18 ‖

Here ends the Kāryākhyānādhikarana (5)

Being common, and owing non-difference thus ‖ 19 ‖

(Adhikarana 6, Sūtra 19)

[431] In the *Vājasaneyaka*, in the *Agnirahasya*, the Sāndilyavidyā has been mentioned—beginning with

'One should worship Satya as Brahman, now indeed is a person constituted of will' (Śa Brā 10 6 3 1)

and ending with—

'He should worship the Ātman—constituted of mind, with Prānas as the body, of lustrous farm, with thoughts fulfilled, constituted of Ākāśa' (Śa Bra 10 6 3 2)

Similarly in the same *Brhadāranyaka*, the Sāndilyavidyā has been mentioned once again—

'This Purusa is constituted of mind, refulgence, truth—there within the heart, like rice or wheat,—this one here is the controller of everything, the ruler of all, the overlord of all—he governs all this, whatever indeed is this (all)' (Br 5 6·1)

तत्र संशयः—किमत्र विद्या भिद्यते, उत न? इति। संयोगचोदनाख्यानामविशेषेऽपि वशित्वाद्युपास्यगुणभेदेन रूपभेदाद्विद्याभेद इति प्राप्ते, उच्यते—समान एवम्, इति। यथाग्निरहस्ये मनोमयप्राणशरीरभारूपसत्यसंकल्पत्वादिगुणगणः श्रुतः, एवं बृहदारण्यकेऽपि मनोमयत्वादिके समाने सति, अधिकस्य वशित्वादेश्च सत्यसंकल्पत्वगुणाभेदाच्च रूपभेदः। अतो विद्यैक्यम् ॥ १९ ॥

समानाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (६)

संबन्धादेवमन्यत्रापि ॥ २० ॥

(अधिकरण ७, सूत्राणि २०–२२)

[432] बृहदारण्यके श्रूयते—

'सत्यं ब्रह्म' (बृ. ५।५।१)

इत्युपक्रम्य

'तद्यत्तत्सत्यमसौ स आदित्यो य एष एतस्मिन्मण्डले पुरुषो यश्चायं दक्षिणेऽक्षन्' (बृ. ५।५।२)

इत्युपक्रम्य, आदित्यमण्डलेऽक्षिणि च सत्यस्य ब्रह्मणो व्याहृतिशरीरत्वेनोपास्यत्वमुक्त्वा

'तस्योपनिषदहः' (बृ. ५।५।३)

इत्यधिदैवतम्

There (arises) a doubt—Is here the Vidyā different or not?—Although the connection, directive, and name are common, there is difference in Vidyā on account of the difference in form, due to the difference in qualities of the object of worship, being the controller etc.—This (prima-facie view) being reached, it is said (in reply)—Samāna evam—being common thus—As in the *Agnirahasya* is mentioned the host of qualities — being constituted of mind, having the Prāṇa-body, form of refulgence, having thoughts fulfilled etc.,—thus even in the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*, being constituted of mind etc., being common, and being the controller etc., not being different. from the quality, having the thoughts fulfilled—there is no difference of form Therefore, there is the oneness of Vidyā. ॥ 19 ॥

Here ends the Samānādhikaraṇa (6)

On account of the connection thus, elsewhere also ॥ 20 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 7, Sūtras 20-22)

[432] It is mentioned in the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*, having introduced

'Satya, Brahman' (Br. 5·5·1)

beginning with

'There what (is) Satya, that is that Āditya, who, this one, (is) the Puruṣa in this orb, and this one in the right eye' (Br. 5·5·2)

and having mentioned that Satya Brahman in the orb of the Sun and the eye, as the object of worship, with the name as the body,—two Upaniṣads — secret names — referring to the deities, in

'His secret name is Ahaḥ' (Br. 5·5·3)

'तस्योपनिषदहम्' (बृ. ५।५।४)

इत्यध्यात्ममिति द्वे उपनिषदौ रहस्यनामनी उपासनशेषतयाम्नायेते। ते किं यथाश्रुतस्थानविशेषनियतत्वेन व्यवस्थिते, उतोभयत्रोभे अनियमेन? इति संशये, सत्यस्य व्याहृतिशरीरस्यैवोपास्यस्य ब्रह्मणो द्वयोः स्थानयोः संबन्धादुपास्यैक्येन रूपाभेदात्संयोगाद्यभेदाच्च विद्यैक्यादनियमेनेति प्राप्तम्।

तदिदमुच्यते —संबन्धादेवमन्यत्रापि, इति। यथा मनोमयत्वादिगुणविशिष्टस्यैक्यादुपास्यैक्येन रूपाभेदाद्विद्यैक्याद्गुणोपसंहारः, एवमन्यत्राक्ष्यादित्यसंबन्धिनो ब्रह्मणः सत्यस्यैकत्वेन विद्यैक्यादुभयोरुभयत्रोपसंहार इति ॥ २० ॥

[433] एवं प्राप्ते, प्रचक्ष्महे—

न वा विशेषात् ॥ २१ ॥

न वैतदस्ति यद्विद्यैक्यादुपसंहार इति। कुतः? विशेषात्—उपास्यरूपविशेषात्। ब्रह्मण एकत्वेऽप्येकत्रादित्यमण्डलस्थतयोपास्यत्वम्, इतरत्राक्ष्याधारतयोपास्यत्वमिति स्थानसंबन्धित्वभेदेन रूपभेदाद्विद्याभेदः। नैवं शाण्डिल्यविद्याया उपास्यस्थानं भिद्यते, उभयत्र हृदयाधारत्वेनोपास्यत्वात्। अतो व्यवस्थिते इति ॥ २१ ॥

---

and referring to the body, in

'His secret name Aham' (Br. 5·5·4)

— these are mentioned as forming part of the worship. Are these fixed up as being confined to the particular places as mentioned, or both of them there in both places without any restriction? — This being the doubt, because Brahman is connected with both the places, (Brahman) which is the object of worship, with the body, the name Satya, — there is the non-difference of form on account of the object of worship being the same, and on account of the identity of the Vidyās due to the non-difference of Saṁyoga (association) etc., — this (prima facie view) reached is that there is no restriction —

To this it is said (in reply) — On account of the connection, thus, elsewhere also. Just as there is the inclusion of the qualities on account of the oneness of the entity particularised by qualities like being constituted of mind etc., on account of the Vidyā being one, because of the non-difference of form, as the object of worship is one; in the same way elsewhere, because Satya Brahman is one, connected with the eye, the Sun, there is the inclusion of both in both places || 20 ||

[433] This (prima-facie view) being reached, we say (in reply)—

Not indeed, on account of the distinct form || **21** ||

Not indeed, it is that there is the inclusion on account of the oneness of of Vidyā. Whence? Viśeṣāt—on account of the distinct form of the object of worship. Though Brahman is one, in one place it is the object of worship as abiding in the orb of the Sun; elsewhere (it is the) object of worship as having the eye as its resort—and so, there is the difference of Vidyā, owing to the difference of form, due to the difference connected with the place. Not in this way, is the place of the object of worship in the Śāṇḍilyavidyā, different on account of the object of worship having the heart as the abode in both cases. So, both (the names) are quite in order. || 21 ||

दर्शयति च ॥ २२ ॥

दर्शयति चाक्ष्याधारादित्याधारयोर्गुणानुपसंहारम्

'तस्यैतस्य तदेव रूपं यदमुष्य रूपम्' (छा. १।७।५)

इत्यादिना रूपाद्यतिदेशेन। स्वतो ह्यप्राप्तावतिदेशेन प्राप्त्यपेक्षा ॥ २२ ॥

संबन्धाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (७)

संभृतिद्युव्याप्त्यपि चातः ॥ २३ ॥

(अधिकरण ८, सू. २३)

[434] तैत्तिरीयके राणायनीयानां खिलेषु च

'ब्रह्म ज्येष्ठा वीर्या संभृतानि ब्रह्माग्रे ज्येष्ठं दिवमाततान।
ब्रह्म भूतानां प्रथमोऽथ जज्ञे तेनार्हति ब्रह्मणा स्पर्धितुं कः ॥'
(तै. ब्रा. २।४।६; अथर्वसं १९।२२।२१)

इति ब्रह्मणि ज्येष्ठानां वीर्याणां संभृतिद्युव्याप्तिश्चेत्यादिगुणजातमाम्नातम्। तेषामुपासनविशेषमनारभ्याधीतानां गुणानां सर्वासु विद्यासूपसंहारे प्राप्ते, उच्यते—संभृतिद्युव्याप्त्यपि, इति। संभृतिद्युव्याप्तीति समाहारद्वन्द्वत्वादेकवद्भावः। संभृत्यादिकमनारभ्याधीतमप्यत एव स्थानभेदाद्व्यवस्थाप्यं न सर्वत्रोपसंहर्तव्यम्।

And (the Śruti) mentions ॥ 22 ॥

And (the Śruti) mentions the non-inclusion of the attributes in the case of the two having the eye as the resort, and having the Sun as the resort, by the extended application of the form etc, in

'Of him, here, that same (is) the form what is of this one' (Chā. 1·7·5)

etc., For, when something is not naturally acquired, there is need for its acquisition of the extended application. ॥ 22 ॥

Here ends the Sambandhādhikaraṇa (7)

The aggregate, pervasion of the heaven, and for this very reason ॥ 23 ॥

(Adhikarana 8, Sūtra 23)

[434] In the *Taittirīyaka*, and in the Khila sections admitted by the Rāṇāyanīyas—in (the passage)

'Brahman preeminent powers are brought together; Brahman in the beginning spread out the oldest heaven; and Brahman was born, first among the creatures,—so, who deserves (dares) to compete with Brahman?' (Tai. Brā. 2·4·6; Atharva Sam. 19·22·21)

has been mentioned the group of qualities etc.—collection of preeminent powers, and the pervading of the heaven etc.,—in the case of Brahman The (prima-facie view) being reached,—those qualities are to be included in all Vidyās that are studied, not connected with any particular worship—this is stated (in reply—The aggregate, pervasion of the heaven etc, Sambhṛtidyuvyāpt is a Samāhāra dvandva (compound) and hence indicates only one thing. The aggregate etc., although studied without any specific connection, for this vary reason, have got to be arranged in accordance with the difference of the place, and are not to be included everywhere,

कथमनारभ्याधीतानां स्थानविशेषनियतत्वम् ? स्वसामर्थ्यादिति ब्रूमः। द्युव्याप्तिस्तावद्धृदयाद्यल्पस्थानगोचरासु विद्यासु नोपसंहर्तुं शक्या। संभृत्यादयोऽपि तत्सहचारिणस्तत्तुल्यदेशा इत्यल्पस्थानविषयासु विद्यास्वनुपसंहार्या। शाण्डिल्यदहरादिविद्यास्वल्पस्थानविषयासु

'ज्यायान्पृथिव्या' (छा ३।१४।३)

'यावान्वायमाकाशस्तावानेषोऽन्तर्हृदय आकाशः' (छा. ८।१।३)

इत्यादयस्तत्र तत्राशक्योपसंहारा मनोमयत्वापहतपाप्मत्वादिविशिष्टस्योपास्यस्य माहात्म्यप्रतिपादनपराः ॥ २३ ॥

संभृत्यधिकरण समाप्तम् (८)

पुरुषविद्यायामपि चेतरेषामनाम्नानात् ॥ २४ ॥

(अधिकरण ९, सू. २४)

[435] तैत्तिरीयके पुरुषविद्याम्नायते

'तस्यैव विदुषो यज्ञस्यात्मा यजमान श्रद्धा पत्नी शरीरमिध्ममुरो वेदिर्लोमानि बर्हि' (ना ८०)

इत्यादिका। छान्दोग्येऽपि पुरुषविद्याम्नायते

'पुरुषो वाव यज्ञस्तस्य यानि चतुर्विंशतिवर्षाणि' (छा. ३।१६।१)

How can there be the demarcation with respect to a particular place, in the case of things that are studied as unconnected? — On account of the inherent power — so we say The pervasion of the heaven, for the matter of that, is not possible to be included in the case of Vidyās that have for their province, small places like the heart The aggregate (of the qualities) etc, also existing along with them, and belonging to a similar region — so they are not fit to be included in the Vidyās that have for their province small places In the case of the Sāndilyavidyā, Daharavidyā etc, that have for their province small places, (the attributes mentioned) in (the passages)

'*Bigger than Prthivi*' (Cha 3 14 3)

'*Of what measure (is) this Ākāśa, of that measure, this Ākāśa within the heart*' (Chā 8 1 3)

etc being impossible to be included there, they aim at the propounding of the greatness of the object of worship particularised by the qualities such as being constituted of mind, and being with sins destroyed etc ‖ 23 ‖

Here ends the Sambhrtyadhikarana (8)

And even in the Purusavidyā (vidyābheda), on account of others (qualities) not being mentioned. ‖ 24 ‖

(Adhikarana 9, Sutra 24)

[435] In the *Taittiriyaka*, the Purusavidyā is described in

'*In this way, of that wise one, of the sacrifice, the Ātman (is) the sacrificer, Sraddhā, the wife, body, the fuel, the chest, the altar, the hair, the sacrificial grass*' (Na 80)

etc In the *Chāndogya* also the Purusavidyā is described in (the passage)

'*Purusa is, verily, the sacrifice, what his twenty-four years*' (Cha 3·16 1)

इत्यादिका। तत्र संशयः—किमत्र विद्या भिद्यते, उत न? इति। पुरुषविद्येति नामैक्यात्पुरुषावयवेषु यज्ञावयवकल्पनसाम्येन रूपैक्यात्, तैत्तिरीयके फलसंयोगाश्रवणात्माह

'षोडशं वर्षशतं जीवति' (छा ३।१६।७)

इति छान्दोग्ये श्रुतस्यैव पुरुषविद्याफलत्वात्फलसंयोगस्याप्यविशेषाद्विद्यैक्यमिति प्राप्ते, उच्यते—

[436] उभयत्राम्नातयोर्विद्ययोः पुरुषविद्यात्वेऽपि विद्याभेदोऽस्त्येव। कुतः? इतरेषामनाम्नानात्। तथाहि—

'यत्सायं प्रातर्मध्यंदिनं च तानि सवनानि' (ना ८०)

इत्यादयस्तैत्तिरीयक आम्नातास्छान्दोग्ये सवनत्वेन नाम्नायन्ते। त्रेधा विभक्तं पुरुषायुषं छान्दोग्ये सवनत्वेन कल्प्यते। छान्दोग्ये (३।१७।१) श्रुतानामशिशिषादीनां दीक्षादित्वकल्पनं तैत्तिरीयके न कृतम्। यजमानपत्न्यादिपरिकल्पनं चान्यथा। अतो रूपमुभयत्र भिद्यते। तथा फलसंयोगोऽपि भिद्यते। तैत्तिरीयके हि पूर्वानुवाके

'ब्रह्मणे त्वा महस ओमित्यात्मानं युञ्जीत' (ना ७९)

---

etc There arises the doubt—Is the Vidyā here different or not? Because there is the sameness of the name, viz Purusavidyā—there is the identity of form on account of the similarity of the imagining of the parts of the sacrifice as the limbs of the Purusa, there is no mention of the fruit in the *Taittiriyaka*, —but there being the connection with the fruit mentioned in the *Chāndogya* itself, in (the passage)

'*He said—He lives for sixteen and one hundred years*' (Cha 3 16 7)

as the Purusavidyā-fruit, even the connection with the fruit being non-different, there is the oneness of Vidyā—This (prima facie view) being reached, this is said (in reply)—

[436] Though both the Vidyās mentioned in the two places have the nature of the Purusavidyā, the difference in the Vidyās does exist Whence? Itaresāmanāmnānāt—on account of the non-mention elsewhere of the qualities mentioned in one recension To explain the same—

'*What is the evening morning and the midday—those (are) the Savanas*' (Na. 80)

etc mentioned in the *Taittiriyaka* are not mentioned in the *Chāndogya* as being Savanas—The life of a man divided into three parts, is mentioned in the *Chāndogya* as the Savana In the *Taittiriyaka* there is no imagining of the desire to eat etc, as being Diksā (sacrificial consecration), etc, mentioned in the *Chāndogya* (3 17 1) and the wife of the sacrificer, etc, are imagined otherwise Therefore, the form is different in both cases Similarly, the connection with the fruit is also different, for, in the previous chapter in the *Taittiriyaka*, having mentioned the Brahmavidyā in

'*For the sake of Brahman, you for the sake of greatness, one should meditate upon the Ātman as Om*' (Na 79)

इति ब्रह्मविद्यामभिधाय तत्फलत्वेन

'ब्रह्मणो महिमानमाप्नोति' (ना. ७९)

इत्युक्त्वा

'तस्यैवं विदुषः' (ना. ८०)

इत्यादिनाम्नाता पुरुषविद्या तस्यैव ब्रह्मविदुषो यज्ञत्वकल्पनमिति गम्यते। अतो ब्रह्मविद्याङ्गत्वाद्ब्रह्मप्राप्तिरेवात्र फलम्। फलवत्संनिधावफलं तदङ्गम्, इति च न्यायात्तैत्तिरीयकाम्नाता पुरुषविद्या ब्रह्मविद्याङ्गमिति गम्यते। छान्दोग्ये त्वायुष्प्राप्तिफला पुरुषविद्येत्युक्तम्। अतो रूपफलसंयोगयोर्भेदाद्विद्याभेद इत्येकत्राम्नातानां गुणानामितरत्रानुपसंहारः ॥ २४ ॥

पुरुषविद्याधिकरणं समाप्तम् (९)

वेधाद्यर्थभेदात् ॥ २५ ॥

(अधिकरण १०, सू. २५)

[437] आथर्वणिका उपनिषदारम्भे

'शुक्रं प्रविध्य हृदयं प्रविध्य' (तै. १।१।१)

इत्यादीन्मन्त्रानधीयते। सामगाश्च रहस्यब्राह्मणारम्भे

'देव सवितः प्रसुव यज्ञं प्रसुव' (सा. ब्रा. १।१।१)

इत्याद्यामनन्ति। काठकास्तैत्तिरीयकाश्च

---

and having mentioned, as the fruit of that (Brahmavidyā)

'He secures the greatness of Brahman' (Nā. 79)

— has been described the Purusavidyā in

'Of him knowing thus' (Nā. 80)

etc.,— thus it is understood that the superimposition of the nature of the sacrifice refers to the same knower of Brahman. Therefore, the acquisition of Brahman itself is the fruit here, as it is connected with the Brahmavidyā. And in conformity with the maxim — *what is proximate to something having the fruit,* that (mentioned) without the fruit is its part — the Puruṣavidyā mentioned in the *Taittirīyaka is understood to be a part of the Brahmavidyā. In the Chāndogya*, however, Puruṣavidyā is mentioned with the securing of a (long) life as the fruit. Therefore, *on account of the difference in the form and the* association with the fruit, there is the difference of Vidyā, and so, the attributes mentioned in one place are not to be included elsewhere. ॥ 24 ॥

Here ends the Purusavidyādhikarana (9)

On account of the difference in the purpose of piercing etc. ॥ 25 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 10, Sūtra 25)

[437] The students of the Atharvaveda, at the beginning of the *Upaniṣad*, read the *Mantras*

'Having pierced through Śukra, having pierced through the heart' (Tai. 1·1·1)

etc.; the Sāma-singers at the beginning of the *Rahasyabrāhmaṇa* read—

'O God Savitṛ, produce the sacrifice, produce.' (Sā. Brā. 1·1·1)

—The students of *Kāṭhaka* and *Taittirīyaka* (read)—

'शं नो मित्रः शं वरुणः' (तै. १।१।१)

इत्यादिकम्। शाट्यायनिनश्च

'श्वेतोऽश्वो हरिनीलोऽसि'

इत्यादिकम्। ऐतरेयिणस्तु महाव्रतब्राह्मणमधीयते

'इन्द्रो ह वै वृत्रं हत्वा महानभवत्'

इत्यादि। कौषीतकिनोऽपि महाव्रतब्राह्मणमेव

'प्रजापतिर्वै संवत्सरस्तस्यैष आत्मा यन्महाव्रतम्'

इति। वाजसनेयिनस्तु प्रवर्ग्यं ब्राह्मणम्

'देवा ह वै सत्रं निषेदुः' (श. ब्रा. १४।१।१।१)

इत्यादि। तत्र संशयः—किमुपनिषदारम्भेष्वधीताः

'शुक्रं प्रविध्य'

'शं नो मित्रः' (तै. १।१।१)

इत्यादयो मन्त्राः प्रवर्ग्यादीनि च कर्माणि विद्याङ्गम्, उत-न? इति। किं युक्तम्? विद्याङ्गमिति। कुतः? संनिधिसमाम्नानाद्विद्याङ्गत्वप्रतीतेः। यद्यपि

'शुक्रं प्रविध्य'

इत्यादीनां मन्त्राणां प्रवर्ग्यादेश्च कर्मणः श्रुतिलिङ्गवाक्यैर्बलवद्भिर्यथायथं कर्मसु विनियोगोऽवगम्यते, तथापि

'*Welfare to us, Mitra, welfare, Varuṇa*' (Tai. 1·1·1)

etc., and the students of the *Sātyāyana* (read)

'*You are the white horse, tawny, and black*'

etc. The students of the Aitareya school read the *Mahāvrata-Brāhmaṇa*—

'*Indra, verily, having killed Vṛtra became great*'

etc. The students of the Kauṣītaki school read the *Mahāvrata-Brāhmaṇa* itself—

'*Prajāpati, verily, is the year; of him this Ātman, what is the great vow.*'

The students of the Yajurveda (Vājasaneyins) read the *Pravargya-Brāhmaṇa*—

'*The gods, verily, indeed, began a sacrificial session.*" (Śa. Brā. 14·1·1·1)

etc.—There (arises) a doubt—Are the *Mantras*

'*Having pierced through Śukra*'

'*Welfare to us, Mitra*' (Tai. 1·1·1)

mentioned in the beginning of the *Upaniṣad*, and the sacrificial rites Pravargya etc , part of the Vidyā or not? What (is) proper? Part of the Vidyā. Whence? On account of the apprehension of their being part of the Vidyā, owing to their mention nearby. Although, the practical application of the *Mantras*—

'*Having pierced through Śukra*'

etc., and of the sacrificial rites Pravargya etc., is known to be associated with the sacrificial rites as the case may be, by means of the (more) powerful Sruti, Liṅga and the passages, still, in the case of the *Mantras*

'शं नो मित्रः' (तै. १।१।१)

'स ह नाववतु' (का. १।१।१, तै. २, ३)

इत्यादिर्मन्त्रस्यान्यत्र विनियोगाभावाद्विद्याधिकाराच्च विद्याङ्गत्वमवर्जनीयमिति सर्वासु विद्यासु ते मन्त्रा उपसंहर्तव्याः—

[438] इति प्राप्ते, प्रचक्ष्महे—वेधाद्यर्थभेदात्।

'शुक्रं प्रविध्य हृदयं प्रविध्य। ऋतं वदिष्यामि। सत्यं वदिष्यामि।' (तै १।१)

'ऋतमवादिषम्। सत्यमवादिषम्।' (तै. १।१२)

'तेजस्वि नावधीतमस्तु। मा विद्विषावहै' (तै. २।१, का. १।१)

इत्यादिभिर्लिङ्गैरभिचाराध्ययनादिष्वेषां विनियोगावगमान्न विद्याङ्गत्वम्।

एतदुक्तं भवति—यथा, हृदयं प्रविध्य, इत्यादिमन्त्रसामर्थ्यात्, शुक्रं प्रविध्य, इत्यादीनामभिचारादिशेषत्वमवगम्यते, एवमेव

'ऋतं वदिष्यामि' (तै. १।१।१)

'तेजस्वि नावधीतमस्तु' (तै. २।१, का. १।१)

इत्यादिमन्त्रसामर्थ्यादेव स्वाध्यायविधिशेषत्वम्

'शं नो मित्रः' (तै. १।१।१)

'Welfare to us, Mitra' (Tai. 1·1·1)

'Let him protect together us both' (Kā. 1·1·1; Tai. 2, 3)

etc., they cannot be made use of elsewhere, and they have the competence for the Vidyā, being a part of the Vidyā is unavoidable; — and so, those *Mantras* have got to be included in all the Vidyās —

[438] This (prima facie view) being reached, we say (in reply)— Vedhādyarthabhedāt — on account of the difference in the purpose of the piercing etc.

'Having pierced through Śukra, having pierced through the heart; I shall speak the right, I shall speak the truth' (Tai. 1·1)

'I have spoken the right; I have spoken the truth' (Tai. 1·12)

'Let the study of us two be spirited. Let us two not hate' (Tai. 2·1; Kā. 1·1)

— These *Mantras* are not a part of the Vidyā as their practical application in respect of the study of the Abhicāra (black magic) etc., is understood by the indicatory marks etc., (in them).

This is what is intended to be said—Just as by virtue of the *Mantras* — Having pierced through the heart—etc , it is understood that (the *Mantras*), —Having pierced through Sukra etc., are subsidiary to the Abhicāra (rite); in the same way, it is understood that the *Mantras* —

'I shall speak the right' (Tai. 1·1·1)

'Let the study of us two be spirited' (Tai. 2·1 : Kā. 1·1)

etc., are subsidiary to the injunction about the study of one's own Veda, by virtue of the *Mantras* themselves—

'Let Mitra be auspicious to us' (Tai. 1·1·1)

इत्यादिमन्त्राणामवगम्यते। अतो न तेषां विद्याङ्गत्वमिति। शुक्रं प्रविध्य, इत्यादीना प्रवर्ग्यादि ब्राह्मणाना चेह पाठो दिवाकीर्त्यत्वारण्येऽनुवाक्यत्वकृत ॥ २५ ॥

वेधाद्यधिकरण समाप्तम् (१०)

हानौ तूपायनशब्दशेषत्वात्कुशाच्छन्दस्तुत्युपगानवत्तदुक्तम् ॥ २६ ॥

(अधिकरण ११, सू २६)

[439] छन्दोगा आमनन्ति

'अश्व इव रोमाणि विधूय पाप चन्द्र इव राहोर्मुखात्प्रमुच्य धूत्वा शरीरमकृत कृतात्मा ब्रह्मलोकमभिसंभवामि' (छा॰ ८।१३।१)

इति। आथर्वणिकाश्च

'तथा विद्वान्पुण्यपापे विधूय निरञ्जन परम साम्यमुपैति' (मु ३।१।३)

इति। शाट्यायनिनस्तु

'तस्य पुत्रा दायमुपयन्ति सुहृद साधुकृत्या द्विषन्त पापकृत्याम्'

इत्यादि। कौषीतकिनस्तु

'तत्सुकृतदुष्कृते विधूनुते। तस्य प्रिया ज्ञातय सुकृतमुपयन्त्यप्रिया दुष्कृतम्' (कौ १।४)

---

etc Therefore they are not a part of the Vidyā —(The *Mantras*) — Having pierced through Sukra—etc, and the Pravargya-Brāhmana sections etc are mentioned here for the purpose of recitation during day, and reading in the forest ॥ 25 ॥

Here ends the Vedhādyadhikarana (10)

Regarding the abandonment however, being subsidiary to the acceptance-passage like the Kuśa, metre, praise, singing—that has been said ॥ 26 ॥

(Adhikarana 11, Sūtra 26)

[439] The students of the *Chāndogya* read—

'Having shaken off sin, like a horse the mane hair, getting out like the Moon from the mouth of Rāhu, shaking off the body from the activity with the Ātman cleansed I proceed to the Brahmaloka (Cha 8 13 1)

— and the students of the Atharvana

Likewise the wise one shaking off the merit and the demerit stainless attains to the maximum similarity (Mu 3 1 3)

—the followers of Satyayana however (read)

'His sons inherit his property friends (his) good deeds, and enemies, the bad deeds

etc —but the Kausitakins (read)

'He shakes off the merit and the demerit his dear kinsmen accept his good deeds and the non favourites the bad deeds

(Kau 1 4)

इति। एवं क्वचित्पुण्यपापयोर्हानि, क्वचित्प्रियाप्रियेषु तत्प्राप्ति, क्वचिदुभय च श्रुतम्। तदुभयमेकैकविद्यायां श्रुतमपि सर्वविद्याङ्गमास्थेयम्, सर्वब्रह्मविद्यानिष्ठस्यापि ब्रह्म प्राप्नुवत पुण्यपापप्रहाणस्यावश्यंभावित्वात्, प्रहीणविषयत्वाच्चोपायनस्य। तच्चिन्तन च विधीयमानं सर्वविद्याङ्गं भवितुमर्हति।

तत्रेदं विचार्यते — हानिचिन्तनमुपायनचिन्तनमुभयचिन्तनं च विकल्पेरन्, उपसंह्रियेरन्वा। किं युक्तम्? विकल्पेरन्निति। कुत? पृथगाम्नानसामर्थ्यात्। समुच्चये हि सर्वदोभयानुसंधानं स्यात्। तच्च कौषीतकिवाक्येनैव सिद्धमित्यन्यत्राम्नानमनर्थकमेव स्यात्। अतोऽनेकत्राम्नानस्य विकल्प एव प्रयोजनम्, न चाध्येतृभेदेन परिहर्तुं शक्यम्। अनेकत्राम्नानमविशेषपुनःश्रवणं ह्यध्येतृभेदपरिहार्यम्। अत्र तु हानिरेव द्वयो शाखयोरुपायनमेव चैकस्याम्। न च विद्याभेदेन व्यवस्थापयितुं शक्यम्, सर्वशेषभूतमिदमनुसंधानमित्युक्तत्वात्।

[440] अत्रेदमुच्यते— हानौ तूपायनशब्दशेषत्वात्, इति।

तुशब्द पक्षं व्यावर्तयति। हानाविति प्रदर्शनार्थम्। केवलाया हानौ केवले चोपायने

---

etc *Thus in some places is mentioned the abandoning of merit and* demerit, in some places the acquisition of them by those agreeable and disagreeable and in some places both Both these although mentioned in one Vidyā (section) have got to be taken as part of all the Vidyās because even a person well-versed in all the Brahmavidyās has got necessarily to abandon merit and sin when he has secured Brahman and because a thing that is given is capable of being abandoned And when contemplation of that is being enjoined that deserves to be the part of all the Vidyās '

There this is being considered — Are the consideration of the abandonment, consideration of the accepting, consideration of both — to be treated as alternatives or are they to be taken *collectively?* — *What (is) proper?* They should be treated as alternatives Whence? On the strength of their separate mention, for, if there *is the collective state, there would be the* association always of both And that is established in the Kausitaki-passage itself, so, the mention elsewhere would be but useless Therefore in the case of the mention in various places the alternative alone is the objective Nor could this be avoided by (banking on) the difference of the students The mention in various places the repeated mention without any change — these can be ignored by referring to the students being different Here, however, the abandonment alone is (mentioned) in the two recensions and acceptance alone in one recension Nor is this possible to be established by the difference of the Vidyās, because it has been stated that this continued association is subsidiary to all —

[440] Here this is said (in reply)—Hānau tūpāyanaśabdaśesatvāt—

The word Tu turns away the (above) view The expression Hanau is merely indicatory *By the mention of the abandonment only and the* mention of the acceptance only, their mutual grouping is bound to be there

श्रूयमाणे तयोरितरेतरसमुच्चयोऽवश्यंभावी। कुतः ? उपायनशब्दशेषत्वात्—उपायनशब्दस्य हानिवाक्यशेषत्वात्, उपायनवाक्यस्य हि हानिवाक्यशेषत्वमेवोचितम्। विदुषा त्यक्तयोः पुण्यपापयोः प्रवेशस्थानवाचित्वादुपायनवाक्यस्य। प्रदेशान्तराम्नातस्य वाक्यस्य प्रदेशान्तराम्नातवाक्यशेषत्वे दृष्टान्ता उपन्यस्यन्ते कुशाच्छन्दस्तुत्युपगानवत्, इति। कौषीतकिनः कुशा वानस्पत्या इत्यामनन्ति। शाट्यायनिनां त्वौदुम्बर्यः कुशा इति वाक्यं सामान्येन वानस्पत्यत्वेनावगताः कुशा औदुम्बर्य इति विशिषत्तद्वाक्यशेषतामापद्यते। तथा देवासुराणां छन्दोभिरित्यादिनाविशेषेण देवासुराणां छन्दसां प्रसङ्गे देवच्छन्दांसि पूर्वमिति वचनं क्रमविशेषं प्रतिपादयत्तद्वाक्यशेषभावं भजते। तथा, हिरण्येन षोडशिनः स्तोत्रमुपाकरोति, इत्यविशेषेण प्राप्ते

'समयाविषिते सूर्ये षोडशिनः स्तोत्रमुपाकरोति' (तै. सं. ६।६।११)

इति विशेषविषयं वाक्यं तद्वाक्यशेषभावं भजते। तथा, ऋत्विज उपगायन्ति, इत्यविशेषप्राप्तस्य

'नाध्वर्युरुपगायेत्' (तै. सं. ६।३।१)

इति वाक्यमनध्वर्युविषयतामवगमयत्तद्वाक्यशेषत्वमृच्छति। एवं सामान्येनावगतमर्थं विशेषेण

Whence ? Upāyanaśabdaśesatvāt—because the word Upāyana is subsidiary (supplementary) to the abandonment-passage, for, it is proper that the Upāyana-passage should be a supplement to the abandonment-passage, because the acceptance-passage denotes a place for entrance of the merit and the demerit abandoned by the wise one. Illustrations are set forth, referring to a passage mentioned in one place as being a supplement to the one mentioned in another place,—Kuśācchandastutyupagānavat. The student of the *Kauṣītaki* read Kuśas as belonging to the trees. But the passage (read by) the followers of Śāṭyāyana particularising the Kuśas mentioned in a general way as associated with trees, as of the Udumbara tree, attains to the status of being a supplement to that passage. Similarly, in (the passage) — By the metres of the gods and Asuras, etc., there being the undesirable contingency of the metres of gods and Asuras being non-different, the statement —the metres of the gods first—propounding the particular order, attains to the status of a supplement to that passage. Similarly, when it is stated in a general way—He helps the stotra for the Ṣoḍaśin (sacrifice) by gold — the passage referring to some particular feature as in

'He helps the stotra for the Ṣoḍaśin (sacrifice) to the Sun spread all around' (Tai. Saṁ. 6·6·11)

attains to the status of a supplement to that passage; similarly, when the general statement—The priests sing — is there in the field, the passage

'The Adhvaryu priest should not sing on' (Tai. Saṁ. 6·3·1)

pointing out to Adhvaryu as not being referred to there, attains to the status of being a supplement to that passage. Thus, in the case of a passage, competent to arrange in a particular manner, a thing known in a general way, an alternative could be resorted to in the case of both the things, by those who

व्यवस्थापयितुं क्षमस्य वाक्यस्य तच्छेषत्वमनभ्युपगच्छद्भिस्तयोरर्थयोर्विकल्पः समाश्रयितव्यः। स च संभवन्त्यां गतौ न युज्यते। तदुक्तं पूर्वस्मिन्काण्डे

'अपि तु वाक्यशेषः स्यादन्याय्यत्वाद्विकल्पस्य विधीनामेकदेशः स्यात्'

(जै. सू. १०।८।४)

इति। तदेवं केवलहानोपायनवाक्ययोरेकवाक्यत्वात्केवलस्य हानस्य केवलस्य चोपायनस्याभावाद्विकल्पो नोपपद्यते। कौषीतकिनामुभयाम्नानमविशेषपुनःश्रवणत्वेन प्रतिपत्तृभेदादविरुद्धम्॥ २६॥

हान्यधिकरणं समाप्तम् (११)

सांपराये तर्तव्याभावात्तथा ह्यन्ये॥ २७॥

(अधिकरण १२, सूत्राणि २७–३१)

[441] सुकृतदुष्कृतयोर्हानमुपायनं च सर्वासु विद्यासु चिन्तनीयमित्युक्तम्। तद्धानं किं देहवियोगकाले देहादुत्क्रान्तस्याध्वनि च, उत देहवियोगकाल एव? इति विशये, उभयत्रेति युक्तम्, उभयथा श्रुतत्वात्। एवं हि कौषीतकिनः समामनन्ति

'स एतं देवयानं पन्थानमापद्याग्निलोकं गच्छति' (कौ. १।३)

---

do not admit (the Viśeṣavākya) as being a supplement to that. And that (Vikalpa) is not proper, if (some other) course is available. It has been stated in the first part (*Pūrvamīmāṁsā*)

'But there would even be a supplement to the Vākya (sentence) as an alternative would be unjustifiable; and it would be a part of the injunctions.' (Jai. Sū. 10 8·4)

Therefore, in this way, the two passages dealing with abandonment and acceptance only forming one passage, only abandonment and only acceptance not being there, there the alternative is ruled out. The mention of both by the Kauṣītakins is not contradictory, on account of the pupils being different, owing to the same thing being repeated without any difference. ॥ 26 ॥

Here ends the Hānyadhikaraṇa (11)

On the departure, on account of the absence of something to be experienced (crossed over), to the same effect others. ॥ 27 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 12, Sūtras 27–31)

[441] It has been stated that the abandonment and acceptance of the good deeds and the evil deeds is to be considered in the case of all Vidyās. Now when there is a doubt — Is that abandonment at the time of the disconnection from the body, on the way after one has departed from the body, or only at the time of the disconnection from the body? — It is proper (to decide that abandonment is) at both (times), on account of the mention in the Śruti, in both ways. Thus indeed do the Kauṣītakins beginning with,

'He, having reached this Devayāna path, goes to the world of Agni' (Kau. 1·3)

इत्युपक्रम्य

'स आगच्छति विरजां नदीम् । तां मनसात्येति । तत्सुकृतदुष्कृते धूनुते'
(कौ. १।४)

इति । अत्र वाक्येऽध्वनि सुकृतदुष्कृतहानिः प्रतीयते । ताण्डिनस्तु

'अश्व इव रोमाणि विधूय पापं चन्द्र इव राहोर्मुखात्प्रमुच्य धूत्वा शरीरमकृतं कृतात्मा ब्रह्मलोकमभिसंभवामि'
(छा. ८।१३।१)

इति । अत्र तु देहवियोगकाल एवेति प्रतीयते । शाट्यायनकेऽपि

'तस्य पुत्रा दायमुपयन्ति सुहृदः साधुकृत्यां द्विषन्तः पापकृत्याम्'

इति पुत्रेषु दायसंक्रान्तिसमकालं सुकृतदुष्कृतसंक्रमणं श्रूयमाणं देहवियोगकाल इति प्रतीयते। अतः सुकृतदुष्कृतयोरेकदेशो देहवियोगकाले हीयते, शेषस्त्वध्वनि, इति प्राप्ते, उच्यते—सांपराये, इति । सांपराये—देहापक्रमणकाल एव, विदुषः सुकृतदुष्कृते निरवशेषं हीयेते । कुतः ? तर्तव्याभावात्—विदुषो देहवियोगात्पश्चात्सुकृतदुष्कृताभ्यां तरितव्यभोगाभावात् । विद्याफलभूतब्रह्मप्राप्तिव्यतिरेकेण हि सुकृतदुष्कृताभ्यां भोक्तव्ये; सुखदुःखे न विद्येते। तथा हि, अन्ये देहवियोगादूर्ध्वं ब्रह्मप्राप्तिव्यतिरिक्तसुखदुःखोपभोगाभावमधीयते

---

read —

'He comes to the Virajā river; he crosses it by the mind; then he shakes off the good deeds and the evil deeds' (Kau. 1·4)

—in this passage, the abandonment of good and evil deeds is apprehended as taking place on the way. The Tāṇḍins on the other hand (say)—

'Having shaken off sin, like a horse the mane-hair, getting out, like the Moon from the mouth of Rāhu, shaking off the body not cleansed, with the Ātman cleansed, I pass on to the Brahmaloka'
(Chā. 8·13·1)

Here again is apprehended that the abandonment takes place only at the time of the disconnection from the body. In the *Śātyāyanaka* also, in (the passage)

'His sons inherit his property; (his) friends, the good deeds; the enemies, the evil deeds'

the transfer of the good deeds and evil deeds simultaneously with the transfer of the heritage to the sons, which is mentioned, is apprehended at the time of the disconnection from the body. Therefore, one portion of the good deeds and the evil deeds is abandoned at the time of the disconnection from the body; and the remainder, on the way—This (prima facie view) being reached, it is stated (in reply)—Sāmparāye—Sāmparāye, at the time of getting out from the body itself—The good deeds and the evil deeds of the wise one are abandoned, without any remainder. Whence? Tartavyābhāvāt—because in the case of the wise one, after the separation from the body, there is the absence of enjoyments which are to be gone through by the good deeds and the evil deeds; for, happiness and misery that are to be experienced due to the good deeds and the evil deeds do not exist over and above the acquisition of Brahman, which is the fruit of the Vidyā. To the same effect others read about the absence of the experience of happiness and misery, over and above the acquisition of Brahman, after the separation from the body in—

'अशरीरं वाव सन्तं न प्रियाप्रिये स्पृशतः' (छा. ८।१२।१)

'एष संप्रसादोऽस्माच्छरीरात्समुत्थाय परं ज्योतिरुपसंपद्य स्वेन रूपेणाभिनिष्पद्यते' (छा. ८।३।४)

'तस्य तावदेव चिरं यावन्न विमोक्ष्येऽथ संपत्स्ये' (छा. ६।१४।२)

इति च ॥ २७ ॥

छन्दत उभयाविरोधात् ॥ २८ ॥

एवमर्थस्वाभाव्यात्सुकृतदुष्कृतहानिकालेऽवधृते सत्युभयाविरोधेन, श्रुतेरर्थस्वभावस्य चाविरोधेन, छन्दतो यथेष्टं पदानामन्वयो वर्णनीयः। कौषीतकिवाक्ये

'तत्सुकृतदुष्कृते धूनुते' (कौ. १।४)

इति चरमश्रुतो वाक्यावयवः

'एतं देवयानं पन्थानमापद्य' (कौ. १।३)

इति प्रथमश्रुतावयवात्प्रागनुगमयितव्यः, इत्यर्थः ॥ २८ ॥

[442] अत्र पूर्वपक्षी प्रत्यवतिष्ठते—

गतेरर्थवत्त्वमुभयथान्यथा हि विरोधः ॥ २९ ॥

सुकृतदुष्कृतयोरेकदेशस्य देहवियोगकाले हानिः, शेषस्य पश्चादित्युभयथा कर्मक्षये

'Him, verily, existing without a body, touch not the agreeable and the disagreeable' (Chā. 8·12·1)

'This Samprasāda, having risen up from this body, having gone unto the highest Light, is manifested in his own nature' (Chā. 8·3·4)

'For him there is delay only so long as he is not freed and is then merged' (Chā. 6·14·2)

and so on ‖ 27 ‖

At will, on account of the non-contradiction between the two. ‖ 28 ‖

Thus, owing to the nature of things, when the time for the abandonment of the good deeds and the evil deeds is ascertained; Ubhayāvirodhen—there being the non-contradiction between the Sruti and the things as they are—Chandatah—at will—the words should be construed (thus)—The portion of the passage read later in the *Kauṣītaki*,

'Then, he shakes off the good deeds and the evil deeds' (Kau. 1·4)

has got to be understood prior to the portion read first, viz.

'Having reached this Devayāna path' (Kau. 1·3)

—This (is) the sense ‖ 28 ‖

[442] The objector (holding the prima facie view) stands up here—

The movement is significant, (when there is Karmakṣaya) in both ways; otherwise, indeed, contradiction ‖ 29 ‖

There is the abandonment of a portion of the good deeds and the evil deeds, at the time of the separation from the body; and afterwards of the

सत्येव गतेरर्थवत्त्वम्, देवयानगतिश्रुतेरर्थवत्त्वमित्यर्थः। अन्यथा हि विरोधः— देहवियोगकाल एव सर्वकर्मक्षये सूक्ष्मशरीरस्यापि विनाशः स्यात्। तथा सति केवलस्यात्मनो गमनं नोपपद्यते। अत उत्क्रान्तिसमये विदुषो निःशेषकर्मक्षयोऽनुपपन्नः ॥ २९ ॥

अत्रोत्तरम्—

उपपन्नस्तल्लक्षणार्थोपलब्धेर्लोकवत् ॥ ३० ॥

उपपन्न एवोत्क्रान्तिकाले सर्वकर्मक्षयः। कथम्? तल्लक्षणार्थोपलब्धेः—क्षीणकर्मणोऽप्याविर्भूतस्वरूपस्य देहसंबन्धलक्षणार्थोपलब्धेः।

'*परं ज्योतिरुपसंपद्य स्वेन रूपेणाभिनिष्पद्यते*' (छा. ८।३।४)

'*स तत्र पर्येति जक्षन्क्रीडन्रममाणः*' (छा. ८।१२।३)

'*स स्वराड्भवति। तस्य सर्वेषु लोकेषु कामचारो भवति*' (छा. ७।२५।२)

'*स एकधा भवति त्रिधा भवति*' (छा. ७।२६।२)

इत्यादिषु देहसंबन्धाख्योऽर्थो ह्युपलभ्यते। अतः, क्षीणकर्मणोऽपि सूक्ष्मशरीरयुक्तस्य देवयानेन गमनमुपपद्यते।

---

remainder — it is only when there is the destruction of Karman in both ways, there is the Gaterarthavattvam — that is to say, the Śruti describing the movement by the Devayāna path is significant; otherwise, indeed, contradiction. —If there were to be the destruction of all Karman at the time of the separation from the body itself, there would be the destruction even of the subtle body. And in that case the movement of the pure Ātman (without Upādhis) does not stand to reason. Therefore, in the case of the wise one, the destruction of Karman without any remainder at the time of the departure (from the body), is not appropriate. ‖ 29 ‖

Here (is) the answer—

Appropriate, on account of the perception of things characterised by 'that (connection with the body), as in the world. ‖ 30 ‖

The destruction of the entire Karman is quite proper at the time of the departure. Whence? Tallakṣaṇārthopalabdheh —On account of the perception of things characterised by the connection with the body in the case of one whose own form is manifest, although with the Karman destroyed—

'*Having gone unto the highest Light, he is manifested in his own form*' (Chā. 8·3·4)

'*He moves about there, eating, sporting, enjoying*' (Chā. 8·12·3)

'*He becomes self-ruler; his is movement at will in all the worlds*' (Chā. 7·25·2)

'*He becomes of one form, becomes three-fold*' (Chā. 7·26 2)

—in these passages etc., the matter, namely, the connection with the body is indeed perceived. Therefore, the movement by the Devayāna is feasible in

कथं सूक्ष्मशरीरमप्यारम्भककर्मविनाशेऽवतिष्ठते ? इति चेत्—विद्यामाहात्म्यादिति ब्रूमः। विद्या हि स्वयं सूक्ष्मशरीरस्यानारम्भिकापि प्राकृतसुखदुःखोपभोगसाधनस्थूलशरीरस्य सर्वकर्मणां च निरवशेषक्षयेऽपि स्वफलभूतब्रह्मप्राप्तिप्रदानाय देवयानेन पथैनं गमयितुं सूक्ष्मशरीरं स्थापयति।

लोकवत्—यथा लोके सस्यादिसमृद्ध्यर्थमारब्धे तडागादिके तद्धेतुषु तदिच्छादिषु विनष्टेष्वपि तदेव तडागादिकमशिथिलं कुर्वन्तस्तत्र पानीयपानादिकं कुर्वन्ति, तद्वत् ॥ ३० ॥

[443] अथ स्यात्, ज्ञानिनां साक्षात्कृतपरतत्त्वानां देहपातसमये कर्मणो निरवशेषक्षयाद्देहपातादूर्ध्वं सूक्ष्मशरीरमात्रं गत्यर्थमनुवर्तते, सुखदुःखानुभवो न विद्यते, इति यदुक्तम्—तन्नोपपद्यते। वसिष्ठापान्तरतमःप्रभृतीनां साक्षात्कृतपरतत्त्वानां देहपातादूर्ध्वं देहान्तरसंगमः पुत्रजन्मविपत्त्यादिनिमित्तसुखदुःखानुभवश्च दृश्यत इति।

अत उत्तरं पठति—

यावदधिकारमवस्थितिराधिकारिकाणाम् ॥ ३१ ॥

नास्माभिः सर्वेषां ज्ञानिनां देहपातसमये सुकृतदुष्कृतयोर्विनाश उक्तः, अपि तु येषां

---

the case of one endowed with a subtle body, even when (all) his Karman is destroyed.

If (it be argued)—How can even the subtle body survive on the destruction of the producing Karman ?—We say (in reply)—On account of the greatness of the Vidyā; for, the Vidyā although of its own accord not producing the subtle body, brings upon the scene the subtle body, in order to enable him to go by the Devayāna path, for bestowing the acquisition of Brahman, which is its fruit, even though there is the destruction without any remainder of the gross body which is the means of enjoyment of the mundane happiness and misery, and of all the Karmans.

Lokavat—as in the world—Just as in the world, in the case of the tank etc., dug up for the purpose of securing a rich harvest of corn etc.,—although the desire etc., of the same, the causes of that (digging up), are extinct, people keeping the same, the tank etc., in tact get out of that, water for drinking etc.,—like that. ॥ 30 ॥

[443] Now as to what has been said—It may be in the case of the wise ones that have directly realised the highest Reality, on account of the destruction of Karman without any remainder, at the time of the falling of the body, only the subtle body continues after the fall of the body, for the sake of movement, (but) the experience of happiness and misery exists not—that is not proper. In the case of Vasiṣṭha and Apāntaratamas, etc., who have directly realised the highest Reality, there is seen the connection with another body, after the fall of the (first) body and the experience of happiness and misery due to the birth and death of a son etc.—

Therefore, (the Sūtrakāra) recites (the answer)—

As long as the qualification, so long the stay of the qualified. ॥ 31 ॥

Not by us has been mentioned the destruction of the good deeds and the evil deeds at the time of the fall of the body, in the case of all wise men; but

ज्ञानिनां देहपातानन्तरमर्चिरादिका गतिः प्राप्ता तेषां ज्ञानिनां देहपातसमये सुकृतदुष्कृतहानिरुक्ता। वसिष्ठादीनां त्वाधिकारिकाणां न देहपातादनन्तरमर्चिरादिगतिप्राप्तिः, प्रारब्धस्याधिकारस्यासमाप्तत्वात्। तेषां कर्मविशेषेणाधिकारविशेषं प्राप्तानां यावदधिकारसमाप्ति तदारम्भकं कर्म न क्षीयते। प्रारब्धस्य हि कर्मणो भोगादेव क्षयः। अतः, आधिकारिकाणां तदारम्भकं कर्म यावदधिकारमवतिष्ठते। अतस्तेषां न देहपातादनन्तरमर्चिरादिगतिप्राप्तिः ॥ ३१ ॥

सांपरायाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (१२)

अनियमः सर्वेषामविरोधः शब्दानुमानाभ्याम् ॥ ३२ ॥

(अधिकरण १३, सू. ३२)

[444] उपकोसलादिषु येषूपासनेष्वर्चिरादिगतिः श्रूयते—किं तन्निष्ठानामेव तया ब्रह्मप्राप्तिः, उत सर्वेषां ब्रह्मोपासननिष्ठानाम्? इति संशये, इतरेष्वनाम्नानात्

'ये चेमेऽरण्ये श्रद्धा तप इत्युपासते' (छा. ५।१०।१)

'श्रद्धां सत्यमुपासते' (बृ. ६।२।१५)

इति, इतरसकलब्रह्मविद्योपस्थापकत्वे प्रमाणाभावाच्च, तन्निष्ठानामेव—

---

only in the case of those knowers, has been stated the abandonment of the good deeds and the evil deeds at the time of the fall of the body, for whom—the wise men—is meant the course, Arcis etc., after the fall of the body. In the case of Vasistha and others, however, who were (specially) qualified, there is no going by the course, Arcis etc., after the fall of the body, on account of the jurisdiction of the Karman begun, not having come to an end. In the case of them who have secured a special qualification owing to some special Karman, that functioning Karman is not destroyed, till the qualification is over; for, the destruction of Karman that has started functioning (comes about) only by experiencing (the fruits of) it. Thus, that producing Karman of those qualified remains as long as the qualification exists. Therefore, in their case there is no taking to movement by the Arcirādı (path) after the fall of the body. ॥ 31 ॥

Here ends the Sāmparāyādhikarana (12)

No rule, (the gati is) for all: non-contradiction with the Śruti and the Smṛti ॥ 32 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 13, Sūtra 32)

[444] Where the movement by the Arcirādi (path) is mentioned in the Upāsanas of Upakosala etc.,—Is there the acquisition of Brahman by that only for those who are firmly attached to them, or for all those who are firmly devoted to the Upāsana of Brahman?—This doubt being there,—On account of this being not mentioned in other Upāsanas, and on account of the absence of any means of proof that all other Brahmavidyās are established in (passages)

'And who, in the forest worship Śraddhā, penance' (Chā. 5·10 1)

'Worship Śraddhā, truth' (Br. 6·2·15)

(Brahmaprāpti) belongs to those alone firmly devoted to that (Upāsana)—

इति प्राप्ते, अभिधीयते—अनियमः, इति । सर्वेषां सर्वोपासननिष्ठानां तयैव गन्तव्यत्वात्तन्निष्ठानामेवेति नियमो नास्ति । सर्वेषां तयैव गमने हि सति शब्दानुमानाभ्यां, श्रुतिस्मृतिभ्याम्, अविरोधः । अन्यथा विरोध एवेत्यर्थः ।

श्रुतिस्तावच्छान्दोग्यवाजसनेयकयोः पञ्चाग्निविद्यायामर्चिरादिमार्गेण सर्वब्रह्मोपासननिष्ठानां गमनमाह—

'य एवमेतद्विदुर्ये चामी अरण्ये श्रद्धां सत्यमुपासते तेऽर्चिषमभिसंभवन्ति'
(बृ. ६।२।१५)

इति वाजसनेयके,

'तद्य इत्थं विदुर्ये चेमेऽरण्ये श्रद्धा तप इत्युपासते तेऽर्चिषमभिसंभवन्ति'
(छा. ५।१०।१)

इति छान्दोग्ये—

—य इत्थं विदुः, इति पञ्चाग्निविद्यानिष्ठान्, ये चेमेऽरण्ये, इत्यादिना श्रद्धापूर्वकं ब्रह्मोपासीनांश्चोद्दिश्यार्चिरादिगतिरुपदिश्यते ।

'सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म' (तै. २।१)
'सत्यं त्वेव विजिज्ञासितव्यम्' (छा. ७।१६।१)

इति सत्यशब्दस्य ब्रह्मणि प्रसिद्धेः । तपःशब्दस्यापि तेनैकार्थ्यात्सत्यतपःशब्दाभ्यां ब्रह्मैवाभि-

---

— This (prima facie view) being reached, it is stated (in reply) — Aniyamah — *there is no rule that (the Brahmaprāpti is) for those well-versed* in them alone, because all those who are well-versed in all the Upāsanas, have to go by that (path); for, only when all go by that, Śabdānumānābhyām — with the Śruti and the Smṛti, — Avirodhaḥ — non-contradiction. Otherwise, there would be definitely a contradiction — this (is) the sense —

The Sruti for the matter of that, in connection with the Pañcāgnividyā in the *Chāndogya* and the *Vājasaneyaka* speaks of the movement by the Arcirādi *path of all those devoted to the Upāsana of Brahman — In the Vājasaneyaka,*

'Who thus, know this, and who these worship Sraddhā, Satya in the forest, — they go unto the Arcis' (Br. 6·2·15)

(and) in the *Chāndogya,*

'Then those who know in this way, and who worship Sraddhā as Tapas in the forest, they go unto the Arcis' (Chā. 5·10·1)

is taught the going by the Arcirādi path, referring to those that are devoted to the Pañcāgnividyā, and who are devoted to Brahman, imbued with faith, in conformity with (respectively) — who know in this way — (and) — and who these in the forest etc., — on account of the word Satya being well-known in the sense of Brahman, in

'Satya, Knowledge, Infinite Brahman' (Tai. 2·1)
'Satya alone should be desired to be known.' (Chā. 7·16·1)

Because the word Tapas also connotes the same sense as that, Brahman alone is

धीयते। श्रद्धापूर्वकं ब्रह्मोपासनं चान्यत्र श्रुतम्—

'सत्यं त्वेव विजिज्ञासितव्यम्' (छा. ७।१६।१)

इत्युपक्रम्य

'श्रद्धा त्वेव विजिज्ञासितव्या' (छा. ७।१९।१)

इति। स्मृतिरपि

'अग्निर्ज्योतिरहः शुक्लः षण्मासा उत्तरायणम्।
तत्र प्रयाता गच्छन्ति ब्रह्म ब्रह्मविदो जनाः॥' (गीता ८।२४)

इति सर्वेषां ब्रह्मविदामनेनैव मार्गेण गमनमित्याह। एवंजातीयकाः श्रुतिस्मृतयो बह्व्यः सन्ति। एवं सर्वविद्यासाधारणीयं गतिः प्राप्तैवोपकोसलविद्यादावनूद्यते॥ ३२॥

अनियमाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (१३)

अक्षरधियां त्ववरोधः सामान्यतद्भावाभ्यामौपसदवत्तदुक्तम्॥ ३३॥

(अधिकरण १४, सू. ३३–३४)

[445] बृहदारण्यके श्रूयते—

'एतद्वै तदक्षरं गार्गि ब्राह्मणा अभिवदन्त्यस्थूलमनण्वह्रस्वमदीर्घमलोहितमस्नेह-

---

denoted by the words Satya and Tapas. And the worship of Brahman preceded by faith is mentioned elsewhere, beginning with

'Satya, verily, alone should be desired to be known' (Chā. 7·16·1)

in

'Śraddhā, verily, alone should be desired to be known' (Chā. 7·19·1)

The Smṛti also, in

'Fire, light, day, bright fortnight, six months when the Sun goes to the north, — people, knowers of Brahman departing there, go to Brahman' (Gītā 8·24)

speaks of the going by this very path in the case of all Brahman-knowers. There are many Śruti and Smṛti passages having a similar import. Thus this course common to all Vidyās, already established, is merely repeated in the Upakosala-Vidyā, etc. ॥ 32 ॥

Here ends the Aniyamādhikaraṇa (13)

But the inclusion of ideas about the Imperishable, on account of the sameness and their existence; like Aupasada, that is mentioned (by Jaimini) ॥ 33 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 14, Sūtras 33–34)

[445] In the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*, the Śruti mentions—

'This, indeed, is that Imperishable, (O) Gārgī, which Brāhmaṇas salute, not gross, not atomic, not short, not long, not

मच्छायमतमोऽवाय्वनाकाशमसङ्गमरसमगन्धमचक्षुष्कमश्रोत्रमवागमनोऽतेजस्कमप्राणममुखममात्रमनन्तरमबाह्यं न तदश्नाति किंचन।... एतस्य वा अक्षरस्य प्रशासने गार्गि सूर्याचन्द्रमसौ विधृतौ तिष्ठतः' (बृ ३।८।८–९)

इति। तथाथर्वणे

'अथ परा यया तदक्षरमधिगम्यते यत्तदद्रेश्यमग्राह्यमगोत्रमवर्णमचक्षुःश्रोत्रं तदपाणिपादम्' (मु. १।१।५–६)

इति। तत्र संशयः—किमिमेऽक्षरशब्दनिर्दिष्टब्रह्मसंबन्धितया श्रुता अस्थूलत्वादयः प्रपञ्चप्रत्यनीकतास्वरूपाः सर्वासु ब्रह्मविद्यास्वनुसंधेयाः, उत यत्र श्रूयन्ते तत्रैव? इति। किं युक्तम्? यत्र श्रुतास्तत्रैवेति। कुतः? विद्यान्तरस्य रूपभूतानां गुणानां विद्यान्तरस्य रूपत्वे प्रमाणाभावात्। प्रतिषेधरूपाणामेषां गुणानामानन्दादिवत्स्वरूपावगमोपायत्वाभावाच्च। आनन्दादिभिरवगतस्वरूपे हि ब्रह्मणि स्थूलत्वादयः प्रपञ्चधर्माः प्रतिषिध्यन्ते निरालम्बनप्रतिषेधायोगात्।

एवं प्राप्ते, प्रचक्ष्महे—अक्षरधियां त्ववरोधः, इति। अक्षरब्रह्मसंबन्धिनीनामस्थूलत्वादिधियां सर्वब्रह्मविद्यास्ववरोधः संग्रहणमित्यर्थः। कुतः? सामान्यतद्भावाभ्याम्। सर्वोपासने

---

red, not oily, not shadow, not darkness, not wind, not sky, not attached, without flavour, without smell, without eye, without ear, without tongue, without mind, without light, without Prāna, without face, without portions, without inside, without outside,—that does not eat anything . Under the direction indeed, of this Aksara, (O) Gārgi, the Sun and the Moon stay on, supported' (Br. 3 8 8–9)

Similarly, in the Āthārvanopanisad

'Now, the higher (Vidyā) by which is apprehended that Aksara,—what that (is) incapable of being seen, incapable of being grasped, without ancestry (family), without caste, without the eye and the ear, that without hands and feet' (Mu 1·1·5–6)

—*There (arises) a doubt*—*Are these (attributes) not being gross etc, that are* mentioned as associated with Brahman pointed out by the word Aksara, which have their nature opposed to worldly existence, to be incorporated in all the Brahmavidyās, or, only where they are mentioned by the Sruti? What proper? Where they are mentioned, only there Whence? Because the attributes that constitute the form of another Vidyā cannot be authoritative for the form of another Vidyā, and because these attributes of negative nature cannot be the means for the apprehension of the nature of the attributes, like bliss etc, For, in the case of Brahman whose nature *is known by the attributes, bliss* etc. the attributes belonging to the worldly existence, like being gross etc, are repudiated, on account of the impossibility of repudiation without any base—

This (prima facie view) being reached, we reply—Aksaradhiyām tvavarodhah—The sense is that there is Avarodha, inclusion in all the Brahmavidyās, of ideas, not being gross etc, that are connected with the Aksara Brahman Whence? Sāmānyatadbhāvābhyām—On account

पूपास्यस्याक्षरस्य ब्रह्मणः समानत्वादस्थूलत्वादीनां तत्स्वरूपप्रतीतौ भावाच्च। एतदुक्तं भवति–

असाधारणाकारेण ग्रहणं हि वस्तुनो ग्रहणम्। न च केवलानन्दादि ब्रह्मणोऽसाधारणमाकारमुपस्थापयति, प्रत्यगात्मन्यप्यानन्दादेर्विद्यमानत्वात्। हेयप्रत्यनीको ह्यानन्दादिर्ब्रह्मणोऽसाधारणं रूपम्। प्रत्यगात्मनस्तु स्वतो हेयविरहिणोऽपि हेयसंबन्धयोग्यतास्ति। हेयप्रत्यनीकत्वं च चिदचिदात्मकप्रपञ्चधर्मभूतस्थूलत्वादिविपरीतरूपम्। अतोऽसाधारणाकारेण ब्रह्मानुसंदधतास्थूलत्वादिविशेषितज्ञानानन्दाद्याकारं ब्रह्मानुसंधेयमित्यस्थूलत्वादीनामानन्दादिवद्ब्रह्मस्वरूपप्रतीत्यन्तर्भावात्सर्वासु ब्रह्मविद्यासु तथैव ब्रह्मानुसंधेयमिति। गुणानां प्रधानानुवर्तित्वे दृष्टान्तमाह—औपसदवत्, इति। यथा जामदग्न्यचतूरात्रपुरोडाशाद्युपसद्गुणभूतः सामवेदपठितः

'अग्निर्वै होत्रं वेतु' (ता. ब्रा. २१।१०।११)

इत्यादिको मन्त्रः प्रधानानुवर्तितया याजुर्वैदिकत्वेनोपांशुत्वेन प्रयुज्यते। तदुक्तं प्रथमे काण्डे

'गुणमुख्यव्यतिक्रमे तदर्थत्वान्मुख्येन वेदसंयोगः' (जै. सू. ३।३।९)

इति ॥ ३३ ॥

---

of the imperishable Brahman, the object of worship, being the same in all the worships, and on account of not being gross etc., being there, on the apprehension of its nature. This is what is intended to be said —

The apprehension of a thing is indeed its apprehension as having some peculiar form. Not again, can mere bliss etc., establish the peculiar form of Brahman, on account of bliss etc., existing even in the inmost Ātman. For, bliss etc., the opposite of everything fit to be abandoned, are the peculiar nature of Brahman. In the case of the inmost Self, however, although he is bereft of what is fit to be abandoned, there is the capability of his association with what is fit to be abandoned. And, being the opposite of what is fit to be abandoned means a form opposite to grossness etc., which are the attributes of the worldly existence constituted of the sentient and the non-sentient. Therefore, while apprehending Brahman characterised by a peculiar form, Brahman is to be apprehended as having the form of knowledge, bliss etc, characterised by not being gross etc., and so (the attributes) not being gross etc., like bliss etc., are included in the apprehension of Brahman; in the same way Brahman is to be incorporated in all Brahma-vidyās. Aupasadavat—Like the Aupasada — (The Sūtrakāra) gives the illustration to show that the attributes follow the Principal (substratum). Just as the *Mantra*

'Let Agni go to the sacrifice' (Tā. Brā. 21·10·11)

etc., read in the *Sāmaveda*, being subordinate to the Upasada (rite) such as Jāmadagnya, Caturātra, Puroḍāśa etc, is employed by the student of the *Yajurveda*, who recites it in the mind (silently), because it goes along with the Principal. That has been said in the first Kāṇḍa (Pūrvamīmāṃsā)

'In the contradiction of the subsidiary and the Principal, there is the association of the Veda with the Principal, as it is for the Principal.' (Jai. Sū. 3·3·9)

|| 33 ||

[446] नन्वेवं सर्वासु ब्रह्मविद्यासु ब्रह्मण एव गुणित्वाद्गुणानां च प्रधानानुवर्तित्वात्

'सर्वकर्मा सर्वगन्धः सर्वरसः' (छा. ३।१४।२)

इत्यादेर्गुणजातस्य प्रतिविद्यं व्यवस्थितस्याप्यव्यवस्था स्यात्। तत्राह—

इयदामननात् ॥ ३४ ॥

आमननम्—आभिमुख्येन मननम्, अनुचिन्तनम्। आमननाद्धेतोरियदेव गुणजातं सर्वत्रानुसंधेयत्वेन प्राप्तं यदस्थूलत्वादिविशेषितमानन्दादिकम्। येन गुणजातेन विना ब्रह्मस्वरूपस्येतरव्यावृत्तस्यानुसंधानं न संभवति तदेव सर्वत्रानुवर्तनीयं तच्चेयदेवेत्यर्थः। इतरे तु सर्वकर्मत्वादयः प्रधानानुवर्तिनोऽपि चिन्तनीयत्वेन प्रतिविद्यं व्यवस्थिताः ॥ ३४ ॥

अक्षरध्यधिकरणं समाप्तम् (१४)

अन्तरा भूतग्रामवत्स्वात्मनोन्यथाभेदानुपपत्तिरिति चेन्नोपदेशवत् ॥ ३५ ॥

(अधिकरण १५, सूत्राणि ३५—३७)

[447] बृहदारण्यके, उषस्तप्रश्न एवमाम्नायते—

'यत्साक्षादपरोक्षाद्ब्रह्म य आत्मा सर्वान्तरस्तन्मे व्याचक्ष्व' (बृ ३।४।१)

---

[446] I say (says the objector) — In this way because Brahman alone, in all Brahmavidyās, is the possessor of attributes and all the attributes go with the principal (substratum), even in the case of the host of attributes in (the passage)

'Possessed of all Karman, possessed of all smell, possessed of all flavour' (Chā. 3·14·2)

etc., although established in respect of each Vidyā, there would be chaos — There says (the Sūtrakāra) —

So much, on account of meditation. ‖ 34 ‖

Āmananam — meditation in a prominent manner, contemplation. Āmananāt, on account of this cause, Iyat — this same host of qualities which is ready for being incorporated everywhere, — that is, bliss etc., particularised by being not gross etc., — without which host of qualities there is no proper apprehension of the nature of Brahman excluded from everything else, — that alone has to be carried forward everywhere, and that is so much — this (is) the sense. Others (qualities), however — being all-doer etc., although following the Principal (Brahman) are established in each Vidyā for being contemplated upon. ‖ 34 ‖

Here ends the Akṣaradhyadhikaraṇa (14)

If, (it be said) on account of one's own Ātman having the host of Bhūtas (beings) within, there would be the impropriety of difference in another way, (the reply is) — No, (there is no Vidyābheda), like the instruction. ‖ 35 ‖

(Adhikaraṇa 15, Sūtras 35–37)

[447] In the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*, apropos the question of Uṣasta, this is stated in the Śrūti—

'What is the direct Brahman, supersensuous, what the Ātman the inmost of all — tell me that' (Br. 3·4·1)

इति । तस्य प्रतिवचनम्—

' य प्राणेन प्राणिति स त आत्मा सर्वान्तरो योऽपानेनापानिति स त आत्मा ' (बृ ३।४।१)

इत्यादि । अतुष्टेन तेन पुनः पृष्ट आह—

' न दृष्टेर्द्रष्टारं पश्येः । न श्रुते श्रोतारं शृणुयाः । न मतेर्मन्तारं मन्वीथाः । न विज्ञातेर्विज्ञातारं विजानीयाः । एष त आत्मा सर्वान्तरः । अतोऽन्यदार्तम् ' (बृ ३।४।२)

इति । तथा तदनन्तरं कहोलप्रश्ने चेवमाम्नायते—

' यदेव साक्षादपरोक्षाद्ब्रह्म य आत्मा सर्वान्तरस्तन्मे व्याचक्ष्व ' (बृ ३।५।१)

इति । प्रतिवचनं च

' योऽशनायापिपासे शोकं मोहं जरां मृत्युमत्येति । एवं हैतमात्मानं विदित्वा ब्राह्मणः पुत्रैषणायाश्च वित्तैषणायाश्च ' (बृ ३।५।१)

इत्यादि

' अतोऽन्यदार्तम् ' (बृ ३।५।१)

इत्यन्तम् ।

तत्र संशय्यते—किमनयोर्विद्याभेदोऽस्ति न वा ? इति । किं युक्तम् ? भेद इति । कुत ? रूपभेदात् । प्रतिवचनभेदाद्रूपं भिद्यते । प्रश्नस्यैक्यरूप्येऽपि प्रतिवचनप्रकारो हि भेदेनोपलभ्यते ।

— The answer of that —

' Who lives (breathes) by the Prāna — he, your Ātman, the inmost of all, one who by the Apāna (wind) moves down, he, your Ātman,' (Br 3 4·1)

etc Asked again by him not satisfied, (Yājñavalkya) said —

' One should not see the seer of sight, one should not hear the hearer of hearing, one should not think of the thinker of thought, one should not know the knower of knowledge — this one, your Ātman, the inmost of all Everything other than this, (is) distressing ' (Br 3·4 2)

Likewise, after that in the question of Kahola, this is mentioned in the Sruti —

' Whatever is indeed the direct Brahman, supersensuous, what the Atman the inmost of all — tell me that ' (Br 3 5 1)

And the answer —

' Who goes beyond hunger and thirst, grief, infatuation, old age, death — Having, verily, known the Ātman thus, a Brāhmana, from a desire for sons, from a desire for wealth' (Br 3·5 1)

etc, ending with —

' Everything else (is) distressing' (Br 3 5 1)

—There it is doubted—Is there the difference of Vidyās in these two or not? What proper? Difference of Vidyās Whence? On account of difference of form The form is different on account of the difference in the answer, for, although the question is of the same form the mode of answer is found to be different. In the former case, the agent of breathing etc, is spoken of as the

पूर्वत्र प्राणनादीनां कर्ता सर्वान्तरात्मत्वेनोच्यते, परत्राशनायापिपासादिरहितः। अतः, पूर्वत्र प्राणिता देहेन्द्रियबुद्धिमनःप्राणव्यतिरिक्तः प्रत्यगात्मोच्यते। परत्र तु, तद्व्यतिरिक्तोऽशनायापिपासादिरहितः परमात्मा। अतो रूपं भिद्यते। भूतग्रामवतश्च प्रत्यगात्मनस्तस्य भूतग्रामस्य सर्वस्यान्तरात्मत्वेन सर्वान्तरत्वमप्युपपन्नम्। यद्यपि प्रत्यगात्मनः सर्वान्तरत्वं भूतग्राममात्रापेक्षत्वेनापेक्षिकं तथापि तदेव ग्राह्यम्। अन्यथा, मुख्यान्तरात्मपरिग्रहलोभात्परमात्मस्वीकारे प्रतिवचनभेदो नोपपद्यते। प्रतिवचनं हि पूर्वत्र प्रत्यगात्मविषयम्, परमात्मनः प्राणितृत्वापानितृत्वाद्यसंभवात्। परं च परमात्मविषयम्, अशनायाद्यतीतत्वात्।

तदिदमाशङ्कते— अन्तरा भूतग्रामवत्स्वात्मनोन्यथा भेदानुपपत्तिरिति चेद्, इति। अन्तरा— सर्वान्तरत्वेन प्रथमप्रतिवचनं भूतग्रामवत्स्वात्मनः, भूतग्रामवांस्तदन्तरः स्वात्मा प्रत्यगात्मा सर्वान्तर इत्युच्यते, इत्यर्थः। अन्यथा

'यः प्राणेन प्राणिति' (बृ. ३।४।१)

'योऽशनायापिपासाद्यतीतः'

इति प्रतिवचनभेदानुपपत्तिरिति चेत्— अत्रोत्तरम्— न, इति। न विद्याभेद इत्यर्थः। उभयत्र परविषयत्वात्प्रश्नप्रतिवचनयोः। तथाहि—

---

inmost Atman of all; in the latter case, as bereft of hunger, thirst etc. Therefore, in the former case, the vivifying agent is called the inmost Self apart from body, sense-organ, intellect, mind, Prāṇa etc., In the latter case, however, (it is) the Paramātman, apart from that, bereft of hunger and thirst etc., Therefore, the form is different. In the case of the inmost Ātman possessing the host of beings, being the inmost of all is quite in order on account of his being the inmost Ātman of that whole host of beings. Although being the inmost of all in the case of the inmost Ātman is relative owing to its dependence solely upon the host of beings, still that alone is to be understood (here). Otherwise, if through the greed for understanding the chief inmost Ātman, it is admitted that the Paramātman is meant (here), the difference in the answers cannot be accounted for. For, the answer in the former case refers to the inmost Ātman, because being the vivifier or being the force to make things go down etc., is impossible in the case of the Paramātman. And the latter refers to the Paramātman, on account of his being beyond hunger etc.

So, this doubt arises — Antarā bhūtagrāmavatsvātmanonythā bhedānupapattiriti cet.. Antarā — being inside all; the first answer Bhūtagrāmavatsvātmanah — possessed of the host of beings, himself inside that, the inmost Ātman is spoken of as being inside all — this (is) the sense. Otherwise,

'Who lives by Prāṇa' (Br. 3·4·1)

'Who is beyond hunger, thirst etc.,'

— this difference in the answers cannot be accounted for — if such (is the objection) — Here the answer — No. No difference in the Vidyās, — this (is) the sense. Because in both the cases the question and the answer refer to the Highest. To explain the same —

'यत्साक्षादपरोक्षाद्ब्रह्म य आत्मा सर्वान्तरः' (बृ. ३।४।१)

इति प्रश्नस्तावत्परमात्मविषय एव। ब्रह्मशब्दस्य परमात्मासाधारणत्वेऽपि प्रत्यगात्मन्यपि कदाचिदुपचरितप्रयोगदर्शनात्तद्व्यावृत्त्या परमात्मप्रतिपत्त्यर्थं यत्साक्षात्ब्रह्मेति विशेषणं क्रियते। अपरोक्षत्वमपि सर्वदेशसर्वकालसंबन्धित्वम्

'सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म' (तै. २।१)

इत्यनन्तत्वेनावगतस्य परमात्मन एवोपपद्यते। सर्वान्तरत्वमपि

'यः पृथिव्यां तिष्ठन्पृथिव्या अन्तरः' (श. ब्रा. १४।६।७।७)

इत्यारभ्य

'य आत्मनि तिष्ठन्नात्मनोऽन्तरः' (श. ब्रा. १४।६।७।३०)

इति सर्वान्तर्यामिणः परमात्मन एव संभवति। प्रतिवचनमपि तथैव परमात्मविषयम्

'यः प्राणेन प्राणिति' (बृ. ३।४।१)

इति। निरुपाधिकं प्राणनस्य कर्तृत्वं परमात्मन एव, प्रत्यगात्मनः सुषुप्तौ प्राणनं प्रति कर्तृत्वाभावात्।

एवमजानतोषस्तेन प्राणने कर्तृत्वमात्रमुक्तं मन्वानेन प्रत्यगात्मनोऽपि साधारणत्वं प्रतिवचनस्य मत्वा, अतुष्टेन पुनः पृष्टस्तं प्रति प्रत्यगात्मनो व्यावृत्तं निरुपाधिकत्वेन प्राणनस्य

'What is the direct supersensuous Brahman, — what Ātman inside of all' (Br. 3·4·1.)

— this question, for the matter of that, refers to the Paramātman alone. Although the word Brahman is peculiar to the Paramātman, its metaphorical use is sometimes seen in the case of the inmost Self — and therefore, the qualifying (particularising) expression, — Yatsākṣātbrahma is put in for the apprehension of the Paramātman by excluding that (Pratyagātman). Being supersensuous also, is appropriate in the case of the Paramātman alone as he is apprehended as endless (infinite), — being connected with all times and all places as in

'Existence, Knowledge, Infinite Brahman' (Tai. 2·1)

Being inside all is possible in the case of the Paramātman alone, who is the inner Controller of all (in accordance with the passage) beginning with

'Who, abiding in Pṛthivī is within Pṛthivī' (Śa. Brā. 14·6·7·7)

and ending with,

'Who, abiding in the Ātman, within the Ātman' (Śa. Brā. 14·6·7·30)

and the answer also in the same way refers to the Paramātman as in

'Who lives by Prāṇa.' (Br. 3·4·1)

Being the unconditional vivifying agent belongs to the Paramātman alone, because the inmost Atman in deep sleep does not possess the nature of an agent in respect of Prāṇana (breathing forth).

Asked again by Uṣasta not knowing this, and thinking that being the agent for the Prāṇana (operation) alone was mentioned, being dissatisfied with the answer, thinking that it (the characteristic) is common to the inmost Ātman also, (Yājñavalkya) described to him the Paramātman as

कर्तारं परमात्मानमाह

'न दृष्टेर्द्रष्टारं पश्येः' (बृ. ३।४।२)

इत्यादिना। इन्द्रियाधीनानां दर्शनश्रवणमननविज्ञानानां कर्तारं प्रत्यगात्मानं प्राणनस्य कर्तृत्वेनोक्त इति न मन्वीथाः, तस्य सुषुप्तिमूर्च्छादौ प्राणनादेरकर्तृत्वात्।

'को ह्येवान्यात्कः प्राण्यात्। यदेष आकाश आनन्दो न स्यात्' (तै. २।७)

इति सर्वप्राणिप्राणनहेतुत्वं हि परमात्मन एवान्यत्र श्रुतम्। अतः पूर्वप्रश्नप्रतिवचने परमात्मविषये। एवमुत्तरे, अपि, अशनायाद्यतीतत्वस्य परमात्मासाधारणत्वात्। उभयत्र

'अतोऽन्यदार्तम्' (बृ. ३।४।२, ३।५।१)

इत्युपसंहारश्चैकरूपः। प्रश्नप्रतिवचनावृत्तिस्तु कृत्स्नप्राणिप्राणनहेतोः परस्य ब्रह्मणोऽशनायाद्यतीतत्वप्रतिपादनाय। तत्र दृष्टान्तमाह—उपदेशवत्, इति। यथा सद्विद्यायाम्

'उत तमादेशमप्राक्ष्यः' (छा. ६।१।१)

इति प्रक्रान्ते सदुपदेशे

'भगवांस्त्वेवमेतद्ब्रवीतु' (छा. ६।१।४)

इति

'भूय एव मा भगवान्विज्ञापयतु' (छा. ६।५।४)

इति प्रश्नस्य

---

distinct from the inmost Ātman and as the unconditional agent of Prāṇana in

'*One should not see the seer of sight*' (Br. 3·4·2)

etc.,—Do not think that the inmost Ātman, who is the agent of perception, hearing, meditation, realisation, dependent upon the sense-organs, is spoken of (here) as being the agent of Prāṇana, because he is not the agent of Prāṇana etc., in deep sleep, swoon etc., for, elsewhere has been mentioned in the Śruti

'*Who indeed would breathe forth, would live, if this Ākāśa were not bliss?*' (Tai. 2·7)

—*that the Paramātman alone is the cause of the breathing forth of all creatures.* Therefore, the first (two)—question and answer — refer to the Paramātman. In the same way the latter two also, because, being beyond hunger etc., is peculiar to the Paramātman. In both cases the conclusion is of the same form as

'*Anything else than this (is) distressing.*' (Br. 3·4·2; 3·5·1)

The repetition of the question and the answer, however, is for the sake of propounding that the Highest Brahman which is the cause of the breathing forth of the entire living creation, is beyond hunger etc. There (*the Sūtrakāra*) cites an illustration, Upadeśavat — Just as in the Sadvidyā (Vidyā dealing with Sat), *the teaching about the Sat being started in*

'*Now, did you ask for that instruction?*' (Chā. 6·1·1)

'*Let His Reverence tell this thus*' (Chā. 6·1·4)

Let once again His Reverence instruct me' (Chā. 6·5·4)

- the repetition again and again of this question, and that of the answer —

'एषोऽणिमैतदात्म्यमिदं सर्वं तत्सत्यम्' (छा. ६।८।७)
इति प्रतिवचनस्य च भूयो भूय आवृत्तिः सतो ब्रह्मणस्तन्माहात्म्यविशेषप्रतिपादनाय दृश्यते, तद्वत्। अत एकस्यैव सर्वान्तरभूतस्य ब्रह्मणः कृत्स्नप्राणिप्राणनहेतुत्वाशनायाद्यतीतत्वप्रतिपादनेन रूपैक्याद्विद्यैक्यम् ॥ ३५ ॥

[448] अथ स्यात्—यद्यप्युभे प्रश्नप्रतिवचने परब्रह्मविषये, तथापि विद्याभेदोऽवर्जनीयः, एकत्र सर्वप्राणिप्राणनहेतुत्वेनोपास्यमितरत्राशनायाद्यतीतत्वेनेत्युपास्यगुणभेदेन रूपभेदात्, प्रष्टृभेदाच्च। पूर्वत्र ह्युषस्तः प्रष्टा, उत्तरत्र तु कहोल इति।

तत्राह—

व्यतिहारो विशिंषन्ति हीतरवत् ॥ ३६ ॥

नात्र विद्याभेदः, प्रश्नप्रतिवचनाभ्यामेकरूपार्थविषयाभ्यामेकेन च विधिपदेनैकवाक्यत्वप्रतीतेः। प्रश्नद्वयं तावत्सर्वान्तरात्मत्वविशिष्टब्रह्मविषयम्। द्वितीये प्रश्ने
'यदेव साक्षादपरोक्षाद्ब्रह्म य आत्मा सर्वान्तरः' (बृ. ३।५।१)
इत्येवकारश्च पूर्वत्रोषस्तेन पृष्टगुणविशिष्टब्रह्मविषयत्वं कहोलप्रश्नस्यावधारयति। प्रतिवचनं चोभयत्र

'This atomic; all this has this as the Ātman' (Chā. 6·8·7)
are seen for the propounding of that peculiar greatness of the Sat Brahman—like that. Therefore, because in the case of the same Brahman which is the inmost of all (beings) there is the exposition of its being the cause of the breathing forth of the entire living creation and being beyond hunger etc., and so, on account of the oneness of form, there is the oneness of Vidyā. ॥ 35 ॥

[488] It may be argued—Although both the question and the answer refer to the Highest Brahman, still the difference in the Vidyās is unavoidable. In one place, (Brahman) is the object of worship owing to its being the cause of the breathing forth of the entire living creation; elsewhere, owing to its being beyond hunger,—thus there is the difference of form on account of the difference in the attributes of the object of worship, and on account of the difference in the questioners; for, Uṣasta (is) the first questioner and Kahola the next.—

There says (the Sūtrakāra)—

Interchange, because they characterise, as in other cases. ॥ 36 ॥

There is no difference of Vidyās, here, because the question and the answer refer to a matter having the same form; and on account of one injunctive expression, there is the apprehension of there being one sentence. The two questions, for the matter of that, refer to the Brahman characterised by being the inmost Self of all. And in the second question, the use of Eva (indeed) in—

'What indeed, the direct supersensuous Brahman, what Ātman inside all' (Br. 3·5·1)
concludes that the question of Kahola refers to Brahman characterised by the attributes, asked about by Uṣasta previously. And the answer in both the places—

'एष त आत्मा सर्वान्तरः' (बृ ३।४।१, ३।५।१)

इति सर्वान्तरात्मत्वविशिष्टब्रह्मविषयमेकरूपमेव। विधिप्रत्ययश्चोत्तरत्रैव दृश्यते

'तस्माद्ब्राह्मणः पाण्डित्यं निर्विद्य बाल्येन तिष्ठासेत्' (बृ. ३।५।१)

इति। एवं सर्वान्तरात्मत्वविशिष्टब्रह्मैकविषयत्वे द्वयोरवधृते सत्येकस्मिन्नेव सर्वान्तरात्मत्वविशिष्टे ब्रह्मण्युपास्ये, उषस्तकहोलयोरितरेतरबुद्धिव्यतिहारः कर्तव्यः। उषस्तस्य या सर्वान्तरात्मनो ब्रह्मणः सर्वप्राणिप्राणनहेतुत्वविषया बुद्धिः, सा कहोलेनापि प्रष्ट्रा कार्या। या च कहोलस्य तस्यैव ब्रह्मणोऽशनायाद्यतीतत्वविषया बुद्धिः, सोषस्तेनापि कार्या। एवं व्यतिहारे कृते, उभाभ्यां सर्वान्तरस्य ब्रह्मणो जीवव्यावृत्तिरवधृता भवति। एवं सर्वान्तरात्मानं प्रत्यगात्मनो व्यावृत्तमवगमयितुं सर्वप्राणिप्राणनहेतुत्वाशनायाद्यतीतत्वप्रतिपादनेन, विंशिषन्ति हि याज्ञवल्क्यस्य प्रतिवचनानि। अतो ब्रह्मणः सर्वान्तरात्मत्वमेवोपास्यगुणः। प्राणनहेतुत्वादयस्तु तस्योपपादका नोपास्याः।

ननूपास्यगुणः सर्वान्तरात्मत्वमेव चेत्, प्राणनहेतुत्वस्याशनायाद्यतीतत्वस्य च प्रष्ट्रोर्व्यतिहृत्यानुसंधानं किमर्थम्?

'Thus, your Ātman, inside all' (*Br. 3·4·1 ; 3·5·1*)

is definitely of the same form, referring as it does to the Brahman particularised by *being the inmost* Ātman of all. *And the injunctive termination is seen in* the latter only as in

'Therefore, a Brāhmana, getting disgusted with learning, should stay on, as a child.' (Br. 3·5·1)

Thus, when it has been ascertained that in both (places) there is the reference to the same Brahman, particularised by being the inmost Ātman of all, the object of worship, that Brahman is particularised by being the inmost Ātman of all, the interchange of notions has to be allowed in the case of Usasta and Kahola,—What notion referring to Brahman, the inmost Self of all, being the cause of the breathing forth of all the living creatures, this Uṣasta had, — that has to be taken as entertained by the questioner, Kahola also. And what notion Kahola had, referring to that same Brahman being beyond hunger etc., — that has got to be entertained by Uṣasta also. When the interchange has been effected thus, the distinct nature of Jiva from Brahman, the inmost of all, would be understood by both. Thus, indeed, the answers of Yājñavalkya particularise the inmost Ātman of all, by propounding his being the cause of the breathing forth of all creatures and his being beyond hunger etc., in order to make one understand his being distinct from the Pratyagātman (Jiva). Therefore, in the case of Brahman, being the inmost Ātman of all is itself the *attribute to be meditated upon. Being the cause of the breathing forth etc*., are but the justifying causes of that, and not the objects of worship.

I say (says the objector) — If the attribute of the object of worship is, being the inmost Atman of all alone, for what purpose is the comprehension by mutual exchange, in the case of the (two) questioners, of being the cause of the breathing forth, and being beyond hunger etc. ? —

तदुच्यते—सर्वप्राणिप्राणनहेतुत्वेन सर्वान्तरात्मनि जीवाद्व्यावृत्ते ब्रह्मण्युषस्तेनावधृते सति, कहोलेन जीवस्य सर्वात्मनासंभावितेन स्वभावविशेषेण सर्वान्तरात्मा व्यावृत्तोऽनुसंधेय इति कृत्वा पुनः प्रश्नः कृतः। याज्ञवल्क्योऽपि तदभिप्रायमभिज्ञाय प्रत्यगात्मनोऽसंभावितमशनायादिप्रत्यनीकत्वमुक्तवान्। अतश्चोपास्यस्य व्यावृत्तिप्रतीतिसिद्ध्यर्थमुभाभ्यां परस्परबुद्धिव्यतिहारः कर्तव्यः। इतरवत्—यथेतरत्र सद्विद्यायां भूयो भूयः प्रश्नैश्च प्रतिवचनैश्च तदेव सद्ब्रह्म व्यवच्छिद्यते, न पुनः पूर्वप्रतिपन्नाद्गुणाद्गुणान्तरविशिष्टतयोपास्यं प्रतिपाद्यते, तद्वत् ॥ ३६ ॥

[449] तत्रापि प्रश्नप्रतिवचनभेदे सति, कथमैक्यमवगम्यते? इति चेत्, तत्राह—

सैव हि सत्यादयः ॥ ३७ ॥

सैव हि सच्छब्दाभिहिता परमकारणभूता परा देवतैव

'सेयं देवतैक्षत' (छा. ६।३।२)

'तेजः परस्यां देवतायाम्' (छा. ६।८।६)

इति प्रकृता।

'यथा सोम्य मधु मधुकृतो निस्तिष्ठन्ति' (छा. ६।९।१)

इत्यादिषु पर्यायेषु सर्वेषूपपाद्यते। यतः

To that it is stated (in reply) — When Brahman, the inmost Ātman of all, is definitely understood by Uṣasta to be distinct from Jīva, on account of its being the cause of the breathing forth of all living creatures, a question was put again by Kahola thinking that the inmost Atman of all should be understood as being distinct on account of some particular natural attribute of the Jīva, as it is not possible for Jīva to be the Ātman of all. Yājñavalkya also, understanding his intention, spoke of being the opposite of hunger etc., as impossible in the inmost Atman (Jīva). Therefore, for the purpose of establishing the apprehension about the object of worship being distinct, there has to be effected mutual interchange of notions by the two. — Itaravat — as elsewhere, in the (section describing the) Sadvidyā, the same Sat Brahman is made distinct again and again by questions and answers, and not the object of worship *particularised by other attributes different from the attribute put* forward before, is propounded — like that: ॥ 36 ॥

[449] There also, when there is the difference in the question and the answer, how can *identity be understood? — If this (is the objection)* — There says (the Sūtrakāra) —

That same (Parā devatā) indeed, (the attributes) Satya etc. ॥ 37 ॥

For, that same highest Deity alone, that is the original cause, denoted by the word Sat introduced in

'That this Deity reflected' (Chā. 6·3·2)

'The Tejas in the highest Deity' (Chā. 6·8·6)

is justified in all the succeeding alternatives in

'As, (O) gentle one, the bees stick on to the honey'. (Chā 6·9·1)

Because in

'ऐतदात्म्यमिदं सर्वं तत्सत्यं स आत्मा' (छा. ६।८।७)

इति प्रथमपर्यायोदिताः सत्यादयः सर्वेषु पर्यायेषूपपाद्योपसंह्रियन्ते ।

केचित्तु—व्यतिहारो विशिंषन्ति हीतरवत्, सैव हि सत्यादयः, इति सूत्रद्वयमधिकरण द्वयं वर्णयन्ति । तत्र पूर्वेण

'त्वं वाहमस्मि भगवो देवते । अहं वै त्वमसि भगवो देवते' (जाबा.)

'तद्योऽहं सोऽसौ योऽसौ सोऽहम्' (ऐ. आ. २।२।४।६)

इति वाक्ये जीवपरयोर्व्यतिहारानुसंधानं प्रतिपाद्यत इत्युच्यते, इत्याहुः ।

'तत्सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्म' (छा. ३।१४।१)

'ऐतदात्म्यमिदं सर्वम्...तत्त्वमसि' (छा. ६।८।७)

इत्यवगतसर्वात्मभावविषयत्वादस्य वाक्यस्य, नात्र प्रतिपादनीयमपूर्वमस्तीत्यनादरणीयम् । तत्तु वक्ष्यति—

'आत्मेति तूपगच्छन्ति ग्राहयन्ति च' (ब्र. सू. ४।१।३)

इति । न च सर्वात्मत्वानुसंधानातिरेकेण परस्मिन्ब्रह्मणि जीवत्वानुसंधानं जीवे च परब्रह्मत्वानुसंधानं तथ्यं संभवति ।

उत्तरेण च सूत्रेण

'As all this has this as the Ātman, that (is) Satya, he, the Ātman' (Chā. 6·8·7)

Satya and others mentioned in the first passage, are propounded in all the alternatives and are grouped together.

But some describe the two Sūtras — Vyatihāro visimṣanti hitaravat, Saiva hi Satyādayaḥ — as two topics. There, they say that by the first Sūtra—

'You, verily — I am, (O) divine Deity, I, verily, — You are, (O) divine Deity' (Jābā.)

'That what I, that he; what he, that I' (Ai. Ā. 2·2·4·6)

—in these passages, is propounded the continued interchange of the Jīva and the Paramātman. But this does not deserve to be treated with respect as there is nothing unknown to be propounded here in this passage dealing as it does with the nature of being the Ātman of all, known (already) from

'All that, indeed, this Brahman' (Chā. 3·14·1)

'All this has this as the Ātman — That thou art' (Chā. 6·8·7)

And that (the Sūtrakāra) would state (in the Sūtra)

'They approach, as the Ātman, and grasp it.' (Bra Sū. IV·1·3)

Not, indeed, can the association of the nature of Jīva in the Highest Brahman and the association of the nature of the Highest Brahman in the Jīva as distinct from the association with being the Ātman of all, be possibly real.

What has been said — And by the next Sūtra, oneness of the worship of Satya propounded in

'स यो ह वै तन्महद्यक्ष प्रथमजं वेद सत्य ब्रह्म'　　　　　　(बृ ५।४।१)

इत्यादिवाक्यप्रतिपादितस्य सत्योपासनस्य

'तद्यत्सत्यमसौ स आदित्यो य एष एतस्मिन्मण्डले पुरुषो यश्चायं दक्षिणेऽक्षन्'

(बृ ५।५।२)

इत्यादिवाक्यप्रतिपादितोपासनस्य चैक्यं प्रतिपाद्यत इति—तदप्ययुक्तम्, उत्तरवाक्येऽक्ष्यादित्यस्थानभेदेन विद्याभेदस्य पूर्वमेव

'न वा विशेषात्'　　　　　　(ब्र सू ३।३।२१)

इत्यनेन प्रतिपादितत्वात्। न च द्वयोरनयोर्व्याहृत्यादिशरीरकत्वेन रूपवतोः

'हन्ति पाप्मानं जहाति च य एवं वेद'　　　　　　(छा ५।५।३)

इति च पृथक्संयोगचोदनावतोर्द्वयोरुपासनयोः

'स यो ह वै तन्महद्यक्षं प्रथमजं वेद सत्यं ब्रह्मेति जयतीमाँल्लोकान्'

(बृ ५।४।१)

इति संयोगरूपादिमत्तया निरपेक्षेण पूर्वेणैकेनोपासनेनाभेदः संभवति। न च

'हन्ति पाप्मानं जहाति'　　　　　　(बृ ५।५।३)

इति च गुणफलाधिकारत्वम्, प्रमाणाभावात्। पूर्वेणैकविद्यात्वं प्रमाणमिति चेत्—न, इतरेतरा-

---

'He who, indeed, verily, knows the great wonderful first-born, as Satya Brahman.'　　　　　　(Br. 5·4·1)

etc , and the worship propounded in

'That what (is) Satya, this (is) that Āditya, who (is) this Purusa in this orb, and who, this one in the right eye' (Br 5 5 2)

etc , — (oneness of the two worships) is propounded — That also is improper, because it has already been propounded by the Sūtra

'Not again, on account of distinction'　(Bra Sū III 3·21)

that there is the difference of Vidyās on account of the difference in places — the eye, the Sun etc , in the later passage Not again in the case of these two worships that are possessed of different forms by having the (different) syllables etc , as the body and having separate association (with the fruit) and the directive in the passage

'He kills the sin, and abandons it, — he who knows thus'

(Chā 5 5 3)

— is possible oneness with the previous one independent worship, on account of its being possessed of connection, fruit, etc , as in

'Who, indeed, verily, knows the great wonderful first-born as Satya Brahaman, he conquers these worlds.'　　　　　　(Br 5 4-1)

Nor again, has (the passage)

'He kills the sin, abandons it'　　　　　　(Br 5 5 3)

competence for the subsidiary fruit, on account of the means of proof being absent If it be said that there is the means of proof, — being one Vidyā with the previous one — (Our answer is) — No, on account of mutual interde-

प्रयत्वात्। एकविद्यात्वे निश्चिते सति, पूर्वफलस्यैव प्रधानफलत्वेनोत्तरयोः फलयोर्गुणफलत्वे, तयोर्गुणफलत्वे निश्चिते सति, संयोगभेदाभावात्पूर्वेण विद्यैक्यम्, इतीतरेतराश्रयत्वम्. इत्येवमादिभिर्यथोक्तप्रकारमेव सूत्रद्वयम् ॥ ३७ ॥

अन्तरत्वाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (१५)

कामादीतरत्र तत्र चायतनादिभ्यः ॥ ३८ ॥

(अधिकरण १६, सूत्राणि ३८–४०)

[450] छान्दोग्ये श्रूयते

'अथ यदिदमस्मिन्ब्रह्मपुरे दहरं पुण्डरीकं वेश्म दहरोऽस्मिन्नन्तराकाशः तस्मिन्यदन्तस्तदन्वेष्टव्यम्' (छा. ८।१।१)

इत्यादि। वाजसनेयके च

'स वा एष महानज आत्मा योऽयं विज्ञानमयः प्राणेषु य एषोऽन्तर्हृदय आकाशस्तस्मिञ्छेते सर्वस्य वशी सर्वस्येशानः' (बृ. ४।४।२२)

इत्यादि। तत्र संशयः—किमनयोर्विद्याभेदः, उत न? इति। किं युक्तम्? भेद इति। कुतः? रूपभेदात्। अपहतपाप्मत्वादिगुणाष्टकविशिष्ट आकाशश्छान्दोग्य उपास्यः प्रतीयते। वाज-

---

pendence. When being one Vidyā is ascertained, the fruit in the first (Vidyā) alone being the chief fruit, the subsequent two fruits are subsidiary; and when their being the subsidiary fruit is ascertained, there is the oneness of the Vidyā with the previous one on account of the absence of the difference of the connection — (thus) there is mutual interdependence — Thus by this and other (arguments), the two Sūtras (have to be explained) only in the manner pointed out before. ॥ 37 ॥

Here ends the Antaratvādhikarana (15)

Desire etc., elsewhere and there, from the abodes etc. ॥ 38 ॥

(Adhikarana 16, Sūtras 38–40)

[450] In the *Chāndogya* it is mentioned by the Śruti —

'Now, what this, in this Brahma-city, the Dahara lotus-abode, the Dahara, — within this, Ākāśa, what is inside that, that should be searched for' (Ch. 8·1·1)

etc., And in the *Vājasaneyaka* —

'He, verily, this great unborn Ātman — who this, constituted of Vijñāna, among the Prānas, who, this, within the heart, Ākāśa, sleeps in that, controller of all, ruler of all' (Br. 4·4·22)

etc.,—There (arises) a doubt—Is there the difference in the Vidyās in these two or not? What (is) proper? Difference. Whence? On account of the difference of form. In the *Chāndogya*, Akāśa is apprehended as the object of worship, particularised by the eight attributes, being with sins destroyed etc.,—in the *Vājasaneyaka*, however, is apprehended the object of worship, the one sleeping in the Akāśa, particularised by the attributes, being the controller etc.,

ब्रह्मगुणत्वेन प्रमाणान्तराप्रतिपन्नानां गुणानामेषां सत्यकामत्वादीनाम्

'तस्मिन्यदन्तस्तदन्वेष्टव्यम्' (छा ८।१।१)

'एष आत्मापहतपाप्मा विजरो विमृत्युर्विशोको ऽविजिघत्सोऽपिपासः सत्यकामः सत्यसङ्कल्पः' (छा ८।१।५)

'सर्वस्य वशी सर्वस्येशानः । एष सर्वेश्वर एष भूताधिपतिरेष भूतपाल एष सेतुर्विधरण एषां लोकानामसंभेदाय' (बृ ४।४।२२)

इत्यादिभिरनयोः श्रुत्योरन्यासु च मोक्षार्थोपासनोपास्यब्रह्मगुणत्वेन सादरमुपदेशादेषामलोपः, अपि तूपसंहार एव कार्यः । छान्दोग्ये तावत्

'तद्य इहात्मानमनुविद्य व्रजन्त्येतांश्च सत्यान्कामांस्तेषां सर्वेषु लोकेषु कामचारो भवति' (छा ८।१।६)

इति सत्यकामत्वादिगुणविशिष्टस्य ब्रह्मणो वेदनं विधाय

'अथ य इहात्मानमननुविद्य व्रजन्त्येतांश्च सत्यान्कामांस्तेषां सर्वेषु लोकेष्वकामचारो भवति' (छा ८।१।६)

इत्यवेदननिन्दा क्रियमाणा गुणविशिष्टवेदनस्यादरं दर्शयति । तथा वाजसनेयके

There is no elision of these, on account of the respectful teaching (thereof) as being the qualities of Brahman the object of worship, in the Upāsanas meant for salvation as mentioned in these two Sruti (passages) and other Sruti (passages),

'What is within there, that should be searched for' (Chā. 8 1 1)

'This Ātman, having the sins destroyed ageless, deathless, bereft of grief, bereft of hunger, bereft of thirst, with desires fulfilled, with thoughts fulfilled' (Chā. 8 1 5)

'Controller of all, ruler of all, this Lord of all, this supreme master of beings, this protector of beings, this bridge, the support of these worlds, in order they may not break' (Br 4 4 22)

etc, — in the case of these qualities having the desires fulfilled etc, that are not apprehended by other means of proof as being the qualities of Brahman, their inclusion has got to be effected In the *Chāndogya* for the matter of that, having enjoined the meditation (Vedana) of Brahman particularised by qualities, having desires fulfilled etc, in

'Then who, having known the Ātman, and having these desires fulfilled, go out — of them, there is movement at will, in all the worlds' (Cha 8 1 6)

— and the censure of non-meditation which is being made in

'Then who, having not known the Ātman here, and not having these desires fulfilled, go out — of them there is no movement at will in all the worlds' (Cha 8 1 6)

point out to the respect for meditation (of Brahman) particularised by the qualities Similarly, in the *Vājasaneyaka* on account of the repeated instruction about the overlordship, in

'सर्वस्य वशी सर्वस्येशानः । ... एष सर्वेश्वर एष भूताधिपतिरेष भूतपालः' (बृ. ४।४।२२)

इति भूयो भूय ऐश्वर्योपदेशाद्गुणेष्वादरः प्रतीयते । एवमन्यत्रापि ।

न च मातृपितृसहस्रेभ्योऽपि वत्सलतरं शास्त्रं प्रतारकवदपारमार्थिकान्निरसनीयान्गुणान्प्रमाणान्तराप्रतिपन्नानादरेणोपदिश्य संसारचक्रपरिवर्तनेन पूर्वमेव बम्भ्रम्यमाणान्मुमुक्षून्भूयोऽपि भ्रमयितुमलम् ।

'नेह नानास्ति किंचन' (बृ. ४।४।१९)
'एकधैवानुद्रष्टव्यम्' (बृ. ४।४।२०)

इति तु सर्वस्य ब्रह्मकार्यत्वेन तदात्मकत्वादेकधानुदर्शनं विधायाब्रह्मात्मकत्वेन पूर्वसिद्धनानात्वदर्शनं निषेधतीत्ययमर्थः प्रागेव प्रपञ्चितः ।

'स एष नेति नेत्यात्मा' (बृ. ४।४।२२)

इत्यत्र च, इतिशब्देन प्रमाणान्तरप्रतिपन्नं प्रपञ्चाकारं परामृश्य न तथाविधं ब्रह्मेति सर्वात्मभूतस्य ब्रह्मणः प्रपञ्चविलक्षणत्वं प्रतिपाद्यते । तदेव चानन्तरमुपपादयति

'अग्राह्यो न हि गृह्यते । अशीर्यो न हि शीर्यते । असङ्गो न हि सज्जते । अव्यथितो न व्यथते न रिष्यति' (बृ. ४।४।२२)

'Controller of all, ruler of all ... this Lord of all, this supreme master of beings, this protector of beings' (Bṛ. 4 4·22)
— In this way, elsewhere also

Not again is the Sāstra that is more affectionate than thousands of mothers and fathers, like a misleading fellow, having respectfully mentioned the qualities that are unreal and that are fit to be discarded, that are not known from other means of proof, *stupid enough to be competent to make those* desirous of salvation who are already revolving about by the whirling of the wheel of worldly existence, revolve again and again ! (The Śruti) again in

'Not here is anything whatsoever many' (Br. 4·4·19)
'Only in one form, this should be realised' (Br. 4·4·20)

— having enjoined the meditation in only one way on account of everything having that (Brahman) as the Ātman, being the product of Brahman, repudiates the apprehension of manifoldness arrived at before, on account of its not having Brahman as its Ātman — this matter has already been expounded. And having referred to the form of worldly existence known from other means of proof, by the word Iti, here in

'He, this one; Ātman, not thus, not thus' (Br. 4·4·22)

it is propounded that Brahman which is the Ātman of all, is different from the worldly existence, because Brahman is not of such a nature. And that same (the Śruti) sets forth later in

'Not fit to be grasped, not indeed is he grasped; not fit to be shattered, not indeed is he shattered; not clinging, not indeed does he cling on; not pained, he is not pained, does not come to harm' (Bṛ. 4·4·22)

इति । प्रमाणान्तरग्राह्यविसजातीयत्वात्प्रमाणान्तरेण न गृह्यते । विशरणीयविसजातीयत्वान्न विशीर्यते । एवमुत्तरत्रानुसंधेयम् । छान्दोग्येऽपि

'नास्य जरयैतज्जीर्यति न वधेनास्य हन्यत एतत्सत्यं ब्रह्मपुरमस्मिन्कामाः समाहिताः' (छा. ८।१।५)

इति सर्वविसजातीयत्वं ब्रह्मणः प्रतिपाद्य तस्मिन्सत्यकामत्वादयो विधीयन्ते ॥ ३९ ॥

[452] नन्वेवमपि

'तद्य इहात्मानमनुविद्य व्रजन्त्येतांश्च सत्यान्कामांस्तेषां सर्वेषु लोकेषु कामचारो भवति । स यदि पितृलोककामो भवति' (छा. ८।१।६)

इत्यादिना सत्यकामत्वादिगुणविशिष्टवेदनस्य सांसारिकफलसंबन्धश्रवणान्मुमुक्षोर्ब्रह्म प्रेप्सोर्न सगुणं ब्रह्मोपास्यम् । परविद्याफलं च

'परं ज्योतिरुपसंपद्य स्वेन रूपेणाभिनिष्पद्यते' (छा. ८।३।४)

इतीदमेव । अतः सत्यकामत्वादयो ब्रह्म प्रेप्सोर्नोपसंहार्या इति । अत उत्तरं पठति—

उपस्थितेऽतस्तद्वचनात् ॥ ४० ॥

—(Ātman) cannot be grasped by other means of proof, because he is not homogeneous with what is to be grasped by other means of proof. He is not shattered, because he is not homogeneous with what is fit to be shattered. In this way the thing is to be understood in the succeeding (passages). In the *Chāndogya* also in (the passage) —

'Not by the old age of him, this one becomes old; nor by his murder, (this one) is killed; this is the Satya (real) Brahma-city; here (all) desires are placed together' (Chā 8·1·5)

—having referred to Brahman as quite distinct from everything, the attributes having the desires fulfilled etc, are mentioned in respect of that. ॥ 39 ॥

[452] I say (says the objector) — Even thus in

'Then, those who having realised the Ātman here, and these desires fulfilled, go out — of them there is movement at will in all the worlds; if he is desirous of the world of Pitrs' (Chā. 8·1·6)

etc., the contemplation on one particularised by the qualities, having desires fulfilled etc. is mentioned as being connected with the fruit associated with worldly existence, — for one desirous of release, wishing to reach Brahman, Brahman with attributes is not the object of worship And the fruit of the highest Vidyā is just what (is given) in

'Having gone unto the highest Light, he is manifested in his own form' (Chā 8·3·4)

Therefore, having desires fulfilled etc, are not to be included, in the case of one desirous of reaching Brahman — Here (the Sūtrakāra) recites the answer—

After reaching (Brahman), for this very reason, on account of mention about that. ॥ 40 ॥

उपस्थितिरुपस्थानं ब्रह्मोपसंपत्तिः, उपस्थिते ब्रह्मोपसंपन्ने, सर्वबन्धविनिर्मुक्ते स्वेन रूपेणाभिनिष्पन्ने प्रत्यगात्मन्यत एवोपसंपत्तेरेव हेतोः सर्वेषु लोकेषु कामचार उच्यते

'परं ज्योतिरुपसंपद्य स्वेन रूपेणाभिनिष्पद्यते। स उत्तमः पुरुषः। स तत्र पर्येति जक्षत्क्रीडन्रममाणः स्त्रीभिर्वा यानैर्वा ज्ञातिभिर्वा नोपजनं स्मरन्निदं शरीरम्'

(छा. ८।१२।३)

'स स्वराड् भवति तस्य सर्वेषु लोकेषु कामचारो भवति' (छा. ७।२५।२)

इति। तदेतच्चतुर्थे निपुणतरमुपपादयिष्यते। अतः सर्वेषु लोकेषु कामचारस्य मुक्तोपभोग्यफलत्वान्मुमुक्षोः सत्यकामत्वादयो गुणा उपसंहार्याः ॥ ४० ॥

कामाद्यधिकरणं समाप्तम् (१६)

तन्निर्धारणानियमस्तद्दृष्टेः पृथग्घ्यप्रतिबन्धः फलम् ॥ ४१ ॥

(अधिकरण १७, सू. ४१)

[453] *'ओमित्येतदक्षरमुद्गीथमुपासीत'* (छा. १।१।१)

इत्यादीनि कर्माङ्गाश्रयाण्युपासनानि कर्माङ्गभूतोद्गीथादिमुखेन जुह्वादिमुखेन पर्णतादिवत्कर्माङ्गत्वेन निरूढानुष्ठानानीत्युद्गीथाद्युपासनसंबन्धिनः

Upasthitiḥ — reaching, reaching Brahman; In respect of the inmost Ātman that has reached, that has reached Brahman,—freed from all bondage, manifested in his own form. Atah eva — for this very reason, viz. reaching itself (merging in) Brahman, (free) movement at will, in all the worlds is mentioned in

'Having gone unto the highest Light, he is manifested in his own form, — he, the best Purusa; he moves all round there, eating, sporting, enjoying, in the company of women, or in cars, or with the kinsmen; — not remembering his birth (or) this body'

(Chā. 8·12·3)

'He becomes self-ruler; in all the worlds there is movement at will, for him' (Chā. 7·25·2)

— All this would be set forth in a very convincing manner in the fourth (Adhyāya). Therefore, in the case of one desirous of salvation, qualities, having the desires fulfilled etc., have to be included, owing to free movement in all the worlds being the fruit fit to be enjoyed by the liberated. ॥ 40 ॥

Here ends the Kāmādyadhikarana (16)

Non-rule about meditation on them, on account of that being seen; for separate, non-obstruction indeed the fruit. ॥ 41 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 17, Sūtra 41)

[453] The Upāsanās associated with parts of Karman as mentioned in *'One should worship the imperishable Udgitha as Om'*

(Chā. 1·1·1)

etc., because they have their performance established through the Udgītha, etc., being the part of the rite, like being made of leaves, through the Juhu (ladle) etc., and there being in

'यदेव विद्यया करोति श्रद्धयोपनिषदा तदेव वीर्यवत्तरं भवति'

(छा. १।१।१०)

इति वर्तमाननिर्देशस्य पर्णतादिसंबन्ध्यपापश्लोकश्रवणवत्पृथक्फलत्वकल्पनायोगात् क्रतुषु नियमेनोपसंहार्याणीति—

एवं प्राप्ते, प्रचक्ष्महे—तन्निर्धारणानियमः, इति। निर्धारणम्—निश्चयेन मनसोऽवस्थापनं ध्यानमित्यर्थः। तन्निर्धारणानियमः—कर्मसूद्गीथाद्युपासनानामनियमः।

कुतः ? तद्दृष्टेः। उपलभ्यते ह्युपासनानुष्ठानानियमः

'तेनोभौ कुरुतो यश्चैतदेवं वेद यश्च न वेद' (छा. १।१।१०)

इत्यविदुषोऽप्यनुष्ठानवचनात्। न चाङ्गत्वे सत्युपासनस्यानुष्ठानानियम उपपद्यते। एवमुपासनस्यानङ्गत्वे निश्चिते सति, उपासनविधेः फलाकाङ्क्षायां रात्रिसत्रन्यायेन वीर्यवत्तरत्वं कर्मफलात्पृथग्भूतमेव फलमित्यवगम्यते।

किमिदं वीर्यवत्तरत्वम् ? कर्मफलस्यैवाप्रतिबन्धः। प्रतिबध्यते हि कर्मफलं प्रबलकर्मान्तरफलेन। तावन्तं कालं तदभावोऽप्रतिबन्धः। स ह्यप्रतिबन्धः कर्मफलात्स्वर्गादिविलक्षणात्पृथग्भूतमेव फलम्। तदिदमुच्यते पृथग्घ्यप्रतिबन्धः फलम्, इति।

'Whatever he does by Vidyā, by faith, by Upaniṣad, he makes that itself more powerful' (Chā. 1·1·10)
something connected with the worship of Udgītha etc., referred to in the present tense, (and) there being no possibility of imagining a separate fruit for the same, like the hearing of non-sinful verses connected with the ladle being made of leaves etc.,—(these Upāsanās) are as a rule to be included in the sacrifices—

This (prima facie view) being reached, we say—Tannirdhāranāniyamah. Nirdhāranam—resolutely stabilising the mind, meditation—this (is) *the sense.* Tannirdhāranāniyamaḥ—*no rule regarding the worship, Udgītha etc.* in the Karmans.

Whence ? Taddrṣṭeh—for, no rule about the performance of Upāsanās is found, on account of the mention of the performance by even an unlearned person, in

'Therefore, both of them perform; he who again knows this thus and he who knows not' (Chā. 1·1·10)
Not again (should one say that) no rule about the performance of the worship is appropriate if Upāsanā be a part (of the Karman). Thus, when the worship is ascertained to be not a part, there being the expectancy for the fruit of the worship-rite, it is known that the fruit, being more powerful, is, indeed, separate from the fruit of the Karman, after the maxim of the Rātrisatra.

What is this, being more powerful ? It is nothing but non-obstruction of the fruit of the Karman itself; for, the fruit of the Karman is obstructed by the fruit of another powerful Karman. The absence of that during that period of time (is) non-obstruction. And that non-obstruction indeed, is the fruit which is absolutely different from the fruit of the Karman, pointing to heaven etc. This has been stated (by the Sūtra *portion)—pṛthagghya*-pratibandhah phalam.

इत्यन्तम् । तत्र संशयः—किं पूर्वप्रकृतविद्यैकविद्यात्वेन तदुपास्यविशेषनिर्धारणमनेन क्रियते, उत सर्ववेदान्तोदितपरविद्योपास्यविशेषनिर्धारणम्, इति ? किं युक्तम् ? दहरविद्योपास्यविशेषनिर्धारणमिति । कुतः ? प्रकरणात् । पूर्वस्मिन्ननुवाके दहरविद्या हि प्रकृता

'दहरं विपापं परवेश्मभूतं यत्पुण्डरीकं पुरमध्यसंस्थम् ।
तत्रापि दहरं गगनं विशोकस्तस्मिन्यदन्तस्तदुपासितव्यम् ॥' (ना. १२।३)

इति । अस्मिंश्चानुवाके

'पद्मकोशप्रतीकाशं हृदयं चाप्यधोमुखम्' (ना. १३।२)

इत्यादिना हृदयपुण्डरीकाभिधानमस्य नारायणानुवाकस्य दहरविद्योपास्यविशेषनिर्धारणार्थत्वमुपोद्बलयतीति ।

एवं प्राप्ते, प्रचक्ष्महे—लिङ्गभूयस्त्वात्, इति । अस्य निखिलपरविद्योपास्यविशेषनिर्धारणार्थत्वे भूयांसि लिङ्गानि दृश्यन्ते। तथाहि—परविद्यास्वक्षरशिवशंभुपरब्रह्मपरज्योतिः परतत्त्वपरमात्मादिशब्दनिर्दिष्टमुपास्यं वस्त्विह तैरेव शब्दैरनूद्य तस्य नारायणत्वं विधीयते। भूयसीषु विद्यासु श्रुताननूद्य नारायणत्वविधानभूयस्त्वं नारायण एव सर्वविद्यासूपास्यमस्थूलत्वादि-

इत्यादिना गुणविशिष्टतया चोपास्यत्वेन विहितत्वात्पूर्वं स्वरूपेणानुसंहितस्यापहतपाप्मत्वादिविशिष्टतयानुसंधानार्थमावृत्तिः कर्तव्या। यथा

'इन्द्राय राज्ञे पुरोडाशमेकादशकपालं निर्वपेदिन्द्रायाधिराजायेन्द्राय स्वराज्ञे' (तै. सं. २।३।६)

इतीन्द्रस्यैव राजत्वादिगुणविशिष्टत्वेऽपि तत्तद्गुणसंबन्ध्याकारस्य भिन्नत्वात्प्रदानावृत्तिः क्रियते। तदुक्तं संकर्षणे

'नाना वा देवता पृथक्त्वात्' (जै. सं. का. १४।२।१५)

इति ॥ ४२ ॥

प्रदानाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (१८)

लिङ्गभूयस्त्वात्तद्धि बलीयस्तदपि ॥ ४३ ॥

(अधिकरण १९, सू. ४३)

[455] तैत्तिरीयके दहरविद्यानन्तरमधीयते

'सहस्रशीर्षं देवं विश्वाक्षं विश्वशंभुवम्।
विश्वं नारायणं देवमक्षरं परमं प्रभुम्॥' (ना. १३।१)

इत्यारभ्य

'सोऽक्षरः परमः स्वराट्' (ना १३।२)

---

etc., he is enjoined as the object of worship as particularised by the qualities, the repetition has to be gone through, for the sake of apprehending one already apprehended in his nature before, as particularised by the qualities, having the sins destroyed etc. Just as in

'One should offer the Purodāśa on eleven pot-sherds, to Indra, the King; to Indra, the supreme King; to Indra, the self-King.' (Tai. Saṁ. 2·3·6)

although Indra himself is particularised by the qualities, kingly nature etc., his form as connected with those various qualities being different, the repetition of the offering is gone through That has been said in the *Saṁkarṣaṇa* (section)—

'Devatās are, verily, different, owing to their being separate.' (Jai. Sam. Kā. 14·2·15)

|| 42 ||

Here ends the Pradānādhikaraṇa (18)

On account of the indicatory marks being many, that indeed is more powerful, and that also (is stated) || 43 ||

(Adhikaraṇa 19, Sūtra 43)

[455] In the *Taittirīyaka* after the Daharavidyā, it is read beginning with

'(To) the thousand-headed god, all-eyed, spreading auspiciousness everywhere, all-pervading, Nārāyaṇa, shining, Akṣara, the supreme Lord' (Nā 13·1)

and ending with

'He, the imperishable, supreme self-ruler' (Nā. 13·2)

इत्यन्तम् । तत्र संशयः—किं पूर्वप्रकृतविद्यैकविद्यात्वेन तदुपास्यविशेषनिर्धारणमनेन क्रियते, उत सर्ववेदान्तोदितपराविद्योपास्यविशेषनिर्धारणम्, इति ? किं युक्तम् ? दहरविद्योपास्यविशेषनिर्धारणमिति । कुतः ? प्रकरणात् । पूर्वस्मिन्ननुवाके दहरविद्या हि प्रकृता

' दहरं विपापं परवेश्मभूतं यत्पुण्डरीकं पुरमध्यसंस्थम् ।
तत्रापि दहरं गगनं विशोकस्तस्मिन्यदन्तस्तदुपासितव्यम् ॥ ' (ना. १२।३)

इति । अस्मिंश्चानुवाके

' पद्मकोशप्रतीकाशं हृदयं चाप्यधोमुखम् ' (ना. १३।२)

इत्यादिना हृदयपुण्डरीकाभिधानमस्य नारायणानुवाकस्य दहरविद्योपास्यविशेषनिर्धारणार्थत्वमुपोद्बलयतीति ।

एवं प्राप्ते, प्रचक्ष्महे—लिङ्गभूयस्त्वात्, इति । अस्य निखिलपराविद्योपास्यविशेषनिर्धारणार्थत्वे भूयांसि लिङ्गानि दृश्यन्ते । तथाहि—परविद्यास्वक्षरशिवशंभुपरब्रह्मपरज्योतिःपरतत्त्वपरमात्मादिशब्दनिर्दिष्टमुपास्यं वस्त्विह तैरेव शब्दैरनूद्य तस्य नारायणत्वं विधीयते । भूयसीषु विद्यासु श्रुतानूद्य नारायणत्वविधानभूयस्त्वं नारायण एव सर्वविद्यासूपास्यमस्थूलत्वादि-

---

—There (arises) the doubt—Is by this (passage) made the ascertainment about the particular object of worship (by that Vidyā), as it is but one Vidyā along with the Vidyā previously introduced, or, ascertainment about the particular object of worship of the higher Vidyās mentioned in all the Vedāntas? What proper? The ascertainment about the particular object of worship in the Daharavidyā. Whence? On account of the context; for, in the previous section, the Daharavidyā is indeed the matter in hand—

'The Dahara, free from sin, which is the abode of the highest, which (is) the lotus stationed in the middle of the city; and there also, the Dahara sky, free from grief — what is within that, that should be worshipped.' (Nā. 12·3)

And in this Anuvāka, in

'And, shining like the lotus-bud, the heart with face downwards' (Nā. 13·2)

etc., the appellation, the heart-lotus of this Nārāyaṇa-section corroborates that this is meant for the ascertainment of the particular object of worship of the Daharavidyā

This (prima facie view) being reached, we say (in reply) —Liṅgabhūyastvāt—There are many indicatory marks seen for the purpose of ascertaining the particular object of worship of all Paravidyās. To explain the same — In the Paravidyās, the entity, the object of worship pointed out by the words Akṣara, Siva, Śambhu, Parabrahman, Parajyotis, Paratattva, Paramātman etc., is repeated here by the very same words, and that being Nārāyaṇa is enjoined. Having repeated what has been mentioned in many Śrutis, the frequent enjoining of Nārāyaṇa becomes the additional indicatory mark, in a large measure to ascertain the particular thing, — that Nārāyaṇa alone is the Highest Brahman, the object of worship in all the Vidyās, possessed of

इत्यन्तम् । तत्र संशयः—किं पूर्वप्रकृतविद्यैकविद्यात्वेन तदुपास्यविशेषनिर्धारणमनेन क्रियते, उत सर्ववेदान्तोदितपरविद्योपास्यविशेषनिर्धारणम्, इति ? किं युक्तम् ? दहरविद्योपास्यविशेषनिर्धारणमिति । कुतः ? प्रकरणात् । पूर्वस्मिन्ननुवाके दहरविद्या हि प्रकृता

'दहरं विपापं परवेश्मभूतं यत्पुण्डरीकं पुरमध्यसंस्थम् ।
तत्रापि दहरं गगनं विशोकस्तस्मिन्यदन्तस्तदुपासितव्यम् ॥' (ना. १२।३)

इति । अस्मिंश्चानुवाके

'पद्मकोशप्रतीकाशं हृदयं चाप्यधोमुखम्' (ना. १३।२)

इत्यादिना हृदयपुण्डरीकाभिधानमस्य नारायणानुवाकस्य दहरविद्योपास्यविशेषनिर्धारणार्थत्वमुपोद्बलयतीति ।

एवं प्राप्ते, प्रचक्ष्महे—लिङ्गभूयस्त्वात्, इति । अस्य निखिलपरविद्योपास्यविशेषनिर्धारणार्थत्वे भूयांसि लिङ्गानि दृश्यन्ते । तथाहि—परविद्यास्वक्षरशिवशंभुपरब्रह्मपरज्योतिःपरतत्त्वपरमात्मादिशब्दनिर्दिष्टमुपास्यं वस्त्विह तैरेव शब्दैरनूद्य तस्य नारायणत्वं विधीयते । भूयसीषु विद्यासु श्रुताननूद्य नारायणत्वविधानभूयस्त्वं नारायण एव सर्वविद्यासूपास्यमस्थूलत्वादि-

---

—There (arises) the doubt—Is by this (passage) made the ascertainment about the particular object of worship (by that Vidyā), as it is but one Vidyā along with the Vidyā previously introduced, or, ascertainment about the particular object of worship of the higher Vidyās mentioned in all the Vedāntas? What proper? The ascertainment about the particular object of worship in the Daharavidyā. Whence? On account of the context; for, in the previous section, the Daharavidyā is indeed the matter in hand—

'The Dahara, free from sin, which is the abode of the highest, which (is) the lotus stationed in the middle of the city; and there also, the Dahara sky, free from grief — what is within that, that should be worshipped.' (Nā. 12·3)

And in this Anuvāka, in

'And, shining like the lotus-bud, the heart with face downwards' (Nā. 13·2)

etc., the appellation, the heart-lotus of this Nārāyaṇa-section corroborates that this is meant for the ascertainment of the particular object of worship of the Daharavidyā

This (prima facie view) being reached, we say (in reply) —Liṅgabhūyastvāt—There are many indicatory marks seen for the purpose of ascertaining the particular object of worship of all Paravidyās. To explain the same — In the Paravidyās, the entity, the object of worship pointed out by the words Akṣara, Śiva, Śambhu, Parabrahman, Parajyotis, Paratattva, Paramātman etc., is repeated here by the very same words, and that being Nārāyaṇa is enjoined. Having repeated what has been mentioned in many Śrutis, the frequent enjoining of Nārāyaṇa becomes the additional indicatory mark, in a large measure to ascertain the particular thing, — that Nārāyaṇa alone is the Highest Brahman, the object of worship in all the Vidyās, possessed of

विशेषितानन्दादिगुणकं परं ब्रह्मेति विशेषनिर्णये भूयो बहुतरं लिङ्गं भवति। अत्र लिङ्गशब्दश्चिह्नपर्यायः। चिह्नभूतं वाक्यं बहुतरमस्तीत्यर्थः। तद्धि प्रकरणाद्बलीयः। तदप्युक्तं प्रथमे काण्डे

'श्रुतिलिङ्गवाक्यप्रकरणस्थानसमाख्यानां समवाये पारदौर्बल्यमर्थविप्रकर्षात्' (जै. सू. ३।३।१४)

इति।

यत्तूक्तम्

'पद्मकोशप्रतीकाशम्' (ना. १३।२)

इत्यादिवचनं दहरविद्याशेषत्वमस्योपद्बलयतीति—तन्न, बलीयसा प्रमाणेन सर्वविद्योपास्यविशेषनिर्धारणार्थत्वेऽवधृते सति दहरविद्यायामपि तस्यैव नारायणस्योपास्यत्वेन तद्वचनोपपत्तेः। न च

'सहस्रशीर्षम्' (ना. १३।१)

इत्यादिद्वितीयानिर्देशेन पूर्वानुवाकोदितोपासिना संबन्धः शङ्कनीयः,

'तस्मिन्यदन्तस्तदुपासितव्यम्' (ना. १२।३)

इत्युपासिगतेन कृत्प्रत्ययेनोपास्यस्य कर्मणोऽभिहितत्वात्तदुपास्ये द्वितीयानुपपत्तेः।

'विश्वमेवेदं पुरुषः' (ना. १३।१)

'तत्त्वं नारायणः परः' (ना. १३।१)

---

qualities, bliss etc., particularised by being not gross, etc.—Here the word Liṅga has the meaning of a token. The meaning is that there is many an indicatory passage; and that is more powerful than the context. It also has been stated (by Jaimini) in the First Part.

'In the group of Śruti, indicatory mark, sentence, context, place, name,—each succeeding one is weaker owing to the distance from the meaning' (Jai. Sū. 3·3·14)

As to what has been said, that the expression

'Shining like the lotus-bud' (Nā. 13·2)

etc., corroborates this (Nārāyaṇa-section) being subsidiary to the Daharavidyā —(we reply)—That (is) not (so), because when by a more powerful Pramāṇa (means of proof) it is ascertained about the particular object of worship in all the Vidyās, that passage (authority) is appropriate as pointing out to the same Nārāyaṇa being the object of worship even in the Daharavidyā. Not again should it be doubted that here is a connection with (the root) Upās mentioned in the previous section by the use of the accusative in

'Sahasraśīrṣam' (Nā. 13·1)

because the object of worship is denoted as the object by the Kṛt termination associated with the root Upās in the passage

'What is within that, that is to be worshipped' (Nā. 12·3)

the accusative case is inappropriate as referring to the object of worship by that. And, on account of the reference in the nominative case in

'All this universe, verily, (is) Puruṣa' (Nā. 13·1)

'Reality, the highest Nārāyaṇa' (Nā. 13·1)

इत्यादिप्रथमानिर्देशाच्च प्रथमार्थे द्वितीया वेदितव्या ।

'अन्तर्बहिश्च तत्सर्वं व्याप्य नारायणः स्थितः ।' (ना. १३।१)

'तस्याः शिखाया मध्ये परमात्मा व्यवस्थितः ।
स ब्रह्म स शिवः सेन्द्रः सोऽक्षरः परमः स्वराट् ॥' (ना. १३।२)

इति निर्देशैः सर्वस्मात्परो नारायण एव सर्वत्रोपास्य इति निर्णीयमानत्वाच्च, प्रथमार्थे द्वितीयेति निश्चीयते ॥ ४३ ॥

लिङ्गभूयस्त्वाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (१९)

पूर्वविकल्पः प्रकरणात्स्यात्क्रिया मानसवत् ॥ ४४ ॥

(अधिकरण २०, सूत्राणि ४४–५०)

[456] वाजसनेयकेऽग्निरहस्ये मनश्चितादयोऽग्नयः श्रूयन्ते

'मनश्चितो वाक्चितः प्राणचितश्चक्षुश्चितः श्रोत्रचितः कर्मचितोऽग्निचितः'

(श. ब्रा. १०।५।३)

इति । तत्र संशयः—किमेते मनश्चितादयः सांपादिकत्वेन विद्यारूपा अग्नयः क्रियामयक्रत्वनुप्रवेशेन क्रियारूपाः, आहोस्विद्विद्यामयक्रत्वनुप्रवेशेन विद्यारूपा एव ? इति विशये, क्रियारूपत्वं तावदाह—पूर्वविकल्पः, इत्यादिना । चित्याग्नित्वेन संपादितानामेषां मनश्चितादीनां क्रत्वनु-

---

• etc., the accusative should be understood in the sense of the nominative. And *that the accusative has the sense of the nominative is ascertained on account* of it being decided that Nārāyaṇa alone who is beyond everything is the object of worship everywhere by references such as —

'Nārāyaṇa remains pervading all that inside and outside' (Nā. 13 1)

'Paramātman is well-established in the midst of that flame. He (is) Brahma (-deva); he, Śiva; he, Indra; he, Akṣara; the highest self-ruler' (Nā. 13·2)

|| 43 ||

Here ends the Lingabhūyastvādhikaraṇa (19)

Alternative thought of the previous, on account of context, action may be there like the mind. || 44 ||

(Adhikaraṇa 20, Sūtras 44–50)

[456] In the *Vājasaneyaka*, in the *Agnirahasya* chapter, fires—the mind-piled etc., are mentioned—

'Mind-piled, Vāk-piled, Prāṇa-piled, eye-piled, ear-piled, karman-piled, fire-piled' (Śa. Brā. 10·5·3)

— There (arises) a doubt — Are these mind-piled etc, metaphorically of the nature of Vidyā, having the form of action owing to the entrace into the sacrifice constituted of action, — or, of the nature of Vidyā alone, entering into the sacrifice constituted of Vidyā ? — this being the doubt, (the Sūtrakāra) speaks first of their having the nature of action by (the Sūtra) — Pūrvavikalpaḥ etc. — Because these (fires) mind-piled etc., metaphorically

प्रवेशसाकाङ्क्षाणां स्वदेशे क्रतुविध्यभावात्पूर्वत्र

'असद्वा इदमग्र आसीत्' (श. ब्रा. १०।५।३।१)

इत्यादिनेष्टकचितस्याग्नेः प्रकृतत्वात्तस्य च क्रियामयक्रत्वव्यभिचारित्वेन तत्र क्रतुसंनिधानात्तत्प्रकरणपठिता मनश्चितादयस्तेनेष्टकाचितेनाग्निना विकल्प्यमानाः क्रियारूपा एव स्युः। विद्यारूपाणामपि क्रियामयक्रत्वनुप्रवेशेन क्रियारूपत्वं मानसग्रहवदुपपद्यते। यथा द्वादशाहेऽविवाक्ये दशमेऽहनि मानसग्रहस्य मनोनिष्पाद्यग्रहणासादनस्तोत्रशस्त्रप्रत्याहरणभक्षणत्वेन विद्यारूपस्यापि क्रियामयक्रत्वङ्गतया, क्रियारूपत्वम्, तथेहापि ॥ ४४ ॥

अतिदेशाच्च ॥ ४५ ॥

इतश्चेष्टकचितेनाग्निना मनश्चितादीनां विकल्पः क्रियारूपत्वं चावगम्यते।

'तेषामेकैक एव तावान्यावानसौ पूर्वः' (श. ब्रा. १०।५।३।११)

इति पूर्वस्येष्टकचितस्याग्नेर्वीर्यं मनश्चितादिष्वतिदिश्यते। तेन तुल्यकार्यत्वाद्विकल्पः। ततश्चेष्टकचितवत्तत्क्रतुनिर्वर्तनेन तदङ्गभूता मनश्चितादयः क्रियामयक्रत्वनुप्रवेशेन क्रियामया एवेति ॥ ४५ ॥

---

understood as piled fires which have the expectancy of entering into a sacrifice, have no injunction in a sacrifice in their own place; as previously in (accordance withthe passage)

'Non-existent, verily, was this in the beginning'

(Śa. Brā. 10·5·3·1)

etc., the Agni piled up with bricks is the matter in hand, and that being always invariably associated with sacrifice abounding in sacrificial action, is proximate to the sacrifice, the mind-piled etc, understood in the various contexts being alternated with the brick-piled-fire, would have the form of action alone. Having the form of action even in the case of those constituted of Vidyā, by entrance into a sacrifice involving action is appropriate, like the mental cup. Just as in the Avivākya in the Dvādaśāha (sacrifice), on the tenth day, the mental cup although of the nature of Vidyā, has the nature of action, by being a part of the sacrifice full of action, on account of the taking up, attaining to, praise, glorification, bringing and eating — that are to be effected by the mind; so, (the same case) here also. ॥ 44 ॥

And on account of the extended application. ॥ 45 ॥

For this reason also, it is understood that the mind-piled etc., are alternated with the brick-piled fire and have the nature of action. The strength of the previous brick-piled fire is seen to be extended to the mind-piled etc , in

'Of those, each one of them is that much, so much as the previous one'

(Śa Brā. 10·5·3·11)

Thus, on account of the similarity of action, the alternative exists. And therefore, like the brick-piled (fire), the mind-piled etc., that are subsidiary to that sacrifice, by contributing to its completion are definitely constituted of action by the entrance into the sacrifice full of action. ॥ 45 ॥

[457] एवं प्राप्ते, प्रचक्ष्महे —

विद्यैव तु निर्धारणाद्दर्शनाच्च ॥ ४६ ॥

तुशब्दः पक्षं व्यावर्तयति। यदुक्तं मनश्चितादयः क्रियामयक्रत्वनुप्रवेशेन क्रियामया एवेति, नैतदस्ति। विद्यारूपा एवैते। विद्यारूपक्रत्वन्वयिन इत्यर्थः। कुतः? निर्धारणाद्दर्शनाच्च। निर्धारणं तावत्

'ते हैते विद्याचित एव। विद्यया हैवैत एवंविदश्चिता भवन्ति'

(श. ब्रा. १०।५।३।१२)

इति। वाङ्मनश्चक्षुरादिव्यापाराणामिष्टकादिवच्चयनानुपपत्तेर्मनसा संपादिताग्नित्वेन विद्यारूपत्वे सिद्धेऽपि विद्याचिता एव।

'विद्यया हैवैते' (श. ब्रा. १०।५।३।१२)

इति चावधारणं विद्यामयक्रत्वन्वयेन विद्यारूपत्वज्ञापनार्थमिति निश्चीयते।

दृश्यते चात्रैवैषां शेषी विद्यारूपः क्रतुः।

'ते मनसैवाधीयन्त मनसैवाचीयन्त मनसैषु ग्रहा अगृह्यन्त मनसा स्तुवन्त मनसाशंसन्यत्किं च यज्ञे कर्म क्रियते यत्किं च यज्ञीयं कर्म मनसैव तेषु मनोमयेषु मनश्चित्सु मनोमयमक्रियत' (श. ब्रा १०।५।३।३)

['457] This (prima facie view) being reached, we say (in reply)—

But Vidyā itself, on account of the ascertainment, and on account of the mention in the Śruti. ॥ 46 ॥

The word Tu turns away the (above) view. As to what has been stated that the mind-piled etc., are definitely constituted of action, by the entrance into the sacrifice full of action — It is not so; these have the nature of Vidyā alone, that is to say, they are associated with the sacrifice of the form of Vidyā. Whence? Nirdhāraṇāddarśanācca—Nirdhāraṇam, ascertainment, for the matter of that in —

'These, verily, are Vidyā-piled alone. By Vidyā, indeed, verily, these become piled up for him who knows thus.'

(Śa. Brā. 10·5·3·12)

On account of the impossibility of the piling up etc., of operations of speech, mind, eye etc., as in the case of bricks etc, these are definitely Vidyā-piled, although their having the form of Vidyā owing to their metaphorical nature of fire imagined by the mind, is established; the emphatic statement in

'By Vidyā, indeed, verily, these' (Śa. Brā. 10·5·3·12)

is ascertained to be for the purpose of making known their form of Vidyā, on account of their association with the sacrifice constituted of Vidyā.

And here itself is seen their principal entity, the sacrifice of the form of Vidyā in

'They study by the mind itself,—they are piled by the mind itself, the cups are taken up by the mind in their case; they praising in the mind, extolled in the mind — whatever is the Karman performed in the sacrifice, whatever is the sacrificial action — that is performed mentally by the mind alone, in the case of those constituted of mind, piled of mind.' (Śa. Brā. 10·5·3·3)

इति । इष्टकचितेष्वग्निषु यत्क्रियामयं यज्ञीयं कर्म क्रियते तन्मनोनिर्वर्त्येषु मनश्चिताद्यग्निषु मनोमयमेवाक्रियतेति वचनात्क्रतुरपि विद्यामयोऽत्र प्रतीयते ॥ ४६ ॥

[458] नन्वत्र विधिपदाश्रवणात्फलसंबन्धाप्रतीतेश्चेष्टकाचिताग्न्युपस्थापितक्रियामयक्रतुप्रकरणाद्विद्यामयक्रत्वन्वयेन विद्यारूपतैषां बाध्येत । नेत्याह—

श्रुत्यादिबलीयस्त्वाच्च न बाधः ॥ ४७ ॥

श्रुतिलिङ्गवाक्यानां प्रकरणाद्बलीयस्त्वेन श्रुत्याद्यवगतः क्रतुरेषां तदन्वयश्च दुर्बलेन प्रकरणेन बाधितुं न शक्यते । श्रुतिस्तावत्

'ते हैते विद्याचित एव' (श. ब्रा. १०।५।३।१२)

इति । तान्विवृणोति

'विद्यया हैवैत एवंविदश्चिता भवन्ति' (श. ब्रा. १०।५।३।१२)

इति । विद्यया—विद्यामयेन क्रतुना संबद्धा मनश्चितादयश्चिता भवन्तीत्यर्थः ।

'तान्हैतानेवंविदे सर्वदा सर्वाणि भूतानि चिन्वन्त्यपि स्वपते' (श ब्रा. १०।५।३।१२)

Whatever sacrificial rite constituted of action is performed in the case of the brick-piled fires—that is made mentally itself in the case of the mind-piled fires, etc., to be gone through in the mind—on account of such mention, the sacrifice is also understood as constituted of Vidyā here. ‖ 46 ‖

[458] I say (says the objector)—There being no mention of an injunctive word here, there is no apprehension of the connection with the fruit,—having the form of Vidyā itself, on account of the association with the sacrifice constituted of Vidyā, in the case of these would be stultified because the context is about the sacrifice constituted of action established by the brick-piled fire. (The Sūtrakāra) says—No (in the Sūtra)—

And on account of Śruti etc., being more powerful, no stultification ‖ 47 ‖

Because the Śruti, indicatory mark, (and) sentence are more powerful than the context, the sacrifice known from the Sruti etc., and the connection of these with it, cannot be stultified by the weaker context. The Śruti, for the matter of that (says)

'These, verily, are Vidyā-piled' (Śa. Brā. 10·5·3·12)

(and) expounds them—

'By Vidyā, verily, are these piled, for one who knows thus' (Sa. Brā. 10·5·3·12)

—Vidyayā—by the sacrifice constituted of Vidyā; the mind-piled etc., connected (with that) are piled—this (is) the sense.

'For him, verily, knowing them thus, although piling up, all beings sleep on' (Śa. Brā. 10·5·3·12)

इति लिङ्गम् । वाक्यं च

'एवंविदे चिन्वन्ति' (श. ब्रा. १०।५।३।१२)

इति । समभिव्याहारो वाक्यम् । एवंविदे विद्यामयक्रतुमते सर्वदा सर्वाणि भूतानि चिन्वन्तीत्यर्थः । सर्वभूतकर्तृकं सर्वकालव्यापि चयनं मनसा संपादितं परिमितकर्तृकालक्रियामयेष्टकचितकार्यद्वारेण क्रत्वनुप्रवेशसंभवमलभमानं विद्यामयक्रत्वनुप्रवेशे लिङ्गं भवति ॥ ४७ ॥

[459] यच्चेदमुक्तं विधिप्रत्ययाश्रवणात्फलसंबन्धाप्रतीतेश्च क्रियामयात्क्रतोरन्योऽत्र विद्यामयः क्रतुर्न संभवतीति—तत्राह—

अनुबन्धादिभ्यः प्रज्ञान्तरपृथक्त्ववद्दृष्टश्च तदुक्तम् ॥ ४८ ॥

इष्टकचितान्वयिनः क्रियामयात्क्रतोर्विद्यामयोऽयं क्रतुः पृथक्त्वेनानुबन्धादिभ्यः पृथक्त्वहेतुभ्योऽवगम्यते । अनुबन्धा यज्ञानुबन्धिनो ग्रहस्तोत्रशस्त्रादयः

'मनसैषु ग्रहा अगृह्यन्त मनसा स्तुवन्त मनसाशंसन्' (श. ब्रा. १०।५।३।३)

इत्यादिना प्रतिपादिताः । आदिशब्देन श्रुत्यादयः पूर्वोक्ता गृह्यन्ते । श्रुत्यादिभिः सानुबन्धैर्विद्यामयः क्रतुः पृथगवगम्यत इत्यर्थः ।

—Linga (indicatory mark), for the matter of that,—And the Vākya (sentence is)—

'They pile up for one who knows thus' (Śa. Brā. 10·5·3·12)

A Vākya is the collective mention; that is to say, for one who knows thus, (and so) who is possessed of a sacrifice constituted of Vidyā, all the beings always pile up. The piling up made by all beings, pervading for all times, imagined by the mind—not possibly securing entrance into the sacrifice through the function of the brick-piled (fire) constituted of action, a limited agency, time, and function—becomes the indicatory mark for its entrance into the sacrifice constituted of Vidyā. ॥ 47 ॥

[459] As to what has again been stated that on account of the non-mention of the injunctive termination, and on account of the non-apprehension of the connection with the fruit—no other sacrifice constituted of Vidyā than the sacrifice constituted of action is possible here—There says (the Sūtrakāra)—

From the connection etc., like the separateness of another meditation, and this is seen,—that has been said. ॥ 48 ॥

This sacrifice constituted of Vidyā is known as being different from the sacrifice constituted of action, connected with the brick-piled (fire) from the connection etc., that are the causes of separateness. Anubandhāḥ—cup, praise, eulogy etc., connected with the sacrifice have been propounded in

'By the mind are the cups taken in these, praising by the mind, they eulogised by the mind' (Śa. Brā. 10·5·3·3)

etc.—By the word Adi, Sruti and others mentioned before are understood—That is to say, the sacrifice constituted of Vidyā is known as different on account of Sruti etc., along with the connection.

प्रज्ञान्तरपृथक्त्ववत्—यथा प्रज्ञान्तरं दहरविद्यादिक्रियामयात्क्रतोः पृथग्भूतं श्रुत्यादिभिरवगम्यते, एवमयमपि। एवं चानुबन्धादिभिः पृथग्भूते विद्यामये यज्ञेऽवगते सति विधिः परिकल्प्यते। दृष्टश्चानुवादसरूपेषु कल्प्यमानो विधिः। तदुक्तम्

'वचनानि त्वपूर्वत्वात्' (जै. सू. १०।४।२०)

इति। फलं च

'तेषामेकैक एव तावान्यावानसौ पूर्वः' (श. ब्रा. १०।५।३।११)

इत्यतिदेशात्। स्वक्रतुद्वारेणेष्टकचितस्याग्नेर्यत्फलं तदेव मनश्चितादीनामपि स्वक्रतुद्वारेण फलमित्यवगम्यते ॥ ४८ ॥

[460] यत्पुनरतिदेशेन तुल्यवीर्यत्वावगमात्क्रियामयक्रत्वनुप्रवेशोऽवगम्यत इत्युक्तम्-तत्राह—

न सामान्यादप्युपलब्धेर्मृत्युवन्न हि लोकापत्तिः ॥ ४९ ॥

नावश्यमतिदेशादवान्तरव्यापारस्यापि तुल्यतया भवितव्यं येन क्रियामयक्रत्वनुप्रवेश एषां स्यात्, यस्मात्कस्माचित्सामान्यमात्रादतिदेशोपलब्धेः। उपलभ्यते हि

'स एष एव मृत्युर्य एष एतस्मिन्मडले पुरुषः' (श. ब्रा. १०।५।२।२३)

Prajñāntarapṛthaktvavat — as another meditation is known as separate from the sacrifice constituted of action, the Daharavidyā etc., from the Sruti etc.,—in the same manner, this one also. When the sacrifice constituted of *Vidyā is known thus as separate by the connection etc., the injunction is* postulated. Such an imagined injunction is seen in the case of passages which are of the form of repetitions. It is said in

'But the passages on account of their being not cited before' (Jai. Sū. 10·4·20)

and the fruit on account of the extended application in

'Of those, each one alone so long as the previous one' (Śa. Brā. 10·5·3·11)

—what fruit is there of the brick-piled fire through its own sacrifice, — it is understood that same is the fruit of the mind-piled etc., also, through their own sacrifice. ॥ 48 ॥

[460] As to what has again been said viz. the entrance into the sacrifice constituted of action, is known from the apprehension of its being equally powerful on account of the extended application — There says (the *Sūtrakāra*)—

No, even from (some) common (property), the apprehension; no attaining to the place, like death. ॥ 49 ॥

Not necessarily through extended application even some other (unrelated) operation has to be equal, so that there would be the entrance of these into the sacrifice constituted of action; because an extended application is available from any common point whatsoever; for, that extended application is found in

'This one here is definitely death, — who, this one, is the Puruṣa in this orb. (Śa. Brā. 10·5·2·23)

इत्यादिषु संहर्तृत्वादिसामान्यमात्रादतिदेशः । न हि तत्र मण्डलपुरुषस्य मृत्युवत्तल्लोकापत्तिस्तद्देशप्राप्तिरपि भवति । एवमिहापि मनश्चितादीनामिष्टकाचिताग्निवद्धर्मातिदेशमात्रेणेष्टकचिताग्निदेशरूपक्रियामयक्रत्वनुप्रवेशेनापि न भवितव्यम् । अत इष्टकचिताग्नेः स्वक्रतुद्वारेण यत्फलं तदेव मनश्चितादीनामपि विद्यामयक्रतुद्वारेण फलमित्यतिदेशादवगम्यते ॥ ४९ ॥

परेण च शब्दस्य ताद्विध्यं भूयस्त्वात्त्वनुबन्धः ॥ ५० ॥

परेण च ब्राह्मणेनास्यापि मनश्चिताद्यभिधायिनः शब्दस्य ताद्विध्यं तद्विधत्वं विद्यामयप्रतिपादित्वमवगम्यते । परेण हि ब्राह्मणेन

'अयं वाव लोक एषोऽग्निश्चितस्तस्याप एव परिश्रिताः'

(श. ब्रा. १०।५।४।१)

इत्यादिना

'स यो हैतदेवं वेद लोकं पृणानमेनं भूतमेतत्सर्वमभिसंपद्यते'

(श. ब्रा. १०।५।४।१)

इति पृथक्फला विद्यैव विधीयते । तथा वैश्वानरविद्यादौ च विद्यैव विधीयते । अतोऽग्निरहस्यस्य क्रियैकविषयत्वं नास्ति । एवं तर्हि विद्यामया मनश्चितादयो बृहदारण्यकेऽनुबन्धव्याः,

---

etc., merely on account of the common property viz. the nature of withdrawing into. Not indeed, there in the case of the Orb-person, there is, like death, the attaining to that world — the attaining to that place — also. Thus, here also, the mind-piled etc., like the brick-piled fires cannot be also associated with the sacrifice constituted of place, form, action of the brick-piled fire, merely by virtue of extended application of the nature. Therefore, it is known from the extended application that whatever fruit accrues for the brick-piled fire through its own sacrifice — that same belongs to the mind-piled also, through the sacrifice constituted of Vidyā. ‖ 49 ‖

And by the subsequent (passage), the word is of that nature, and the inclusion here on account of (Agnyaṅgas) being many. ‖ 50 ‖

Pareṇa Ca — And by the *Brāhmaṇa* passage this word (Śruti) also denoting the mind-piled etc. Tādvidhyam — being of the same nature, — it is known that it propounds the sacrifice constituted of Vidyā. By the later *Brāhmaṇa* passage, beginning with —

'*This world, verily, this fire piled; the waters themselves have resorted to that*' (Śa. Brā. 10·5·4·1)

and (ending with)

'*Thus he who, verily, knows this, attains to this gratifying world, this being, all this*' (Śa. Brā. 10·5·4·1)

— Vidyā alone with a separate fruit is enjoined. Similarly, in the Vaiśvānara-Vidyā etc., also, Vidyā alone is enjoined. Therefore, *Agnirahasya* cannot have connection only with action. (The objector retorts) — Well, in that case, the mind-piled etc., constituted of Vidyā should be taken up in the

किमर्थमिहानुबध्यन्ते ? तत्रोच्यते — भूयस्त्वात्त्वनुबन्धः, इति । मनश्चितादिषु संपादनीयानामन्यङ्गानां भूयस्त्वात्तत्संनिधाविहानुबन्धः कृतः ॥ ५० ॥

पूर्वविकल्पाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (२०)

एक आत्मनः शरीरे भावात् ॥ ५१ ॥

(अधिकरण २१, सू. ५१–५२)

[461] सर्वासु परविद्यासूपास्योपासनस्वरूपवदुपासकस्वरूपस्यापि ज्ञातव्यत्वमुक्तम्

'त्रयाणामेव चैवमुपन्यासः प्रश्नश्च' (ब्र. सू. १।४।६)

इति । वक्ष्यति चास्य प्रत्यगात्मनः परमात्मात्मकत्वेनानुसंधानम्

'आत्मेति तूपगच्छन्ति ग्राहयन्ति च' (ब्र सू. ४।१।३)

इति । किमयं प्रत्यगात्मा ज्ञाता कर्ता भोक्तेहामुत्र संचारक्षमोऽनुसंधेयः, उत प्रजापतिवाक्योदितापहतपाप्मत्वादिस्वरूपः ? किं युक्तम् ? ज्ञातृत्वाद्याकारमात्र इत्येके मन्यन्ते । कुतः ? अस्योपासकस्य, आत्मनः शरीरे भावात् । आत्मनः शरीरे वर्तमानस्य तादृशमेव रूपम्, तावतैवानुसंधानेन तत्फलसिद्ध्युपपत्तेश्च । न हि कर्मस्वधिकृतानां स्वर्गादिफलार्थिनां ज्ञातृत्वाद्-

---

Bṛhadāraṇyaka — why are they taken up here ? — There it is said (in reply) — Bhūyastvāttvanubandhah — because the metaphorical accessories of fire, in the case of the mind-piled etc., being many, — in their proximity is the inclusion made here ॥ 50 ॥

Here ends the Pūrvavikalpādhikaraṇa (20)

Some, on account of the Ātman existing in the body. ॥ 51 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 21, Sūtras 51–52)

[461] In the case of all Paravidyās, it has been said that the nature of the worshippers also has to be known, like the nature of the object of worship and the worship in (the Sūtra)

'Thus the exposition of the three only, and the question' (Bra. Sū. I. 4·6)

And (the Sūtrakāra) would also mention that this inmost Ātman is to be associated with the nature of the Paramātman in —

'They understand as the Ātman, and cause it to be grasped' (Bra. Sū. IV. 1·3)

Is this inmost Ātman, as the knower, the doer, the enjoyer, capable of movement here and hereafter, to be understood, or as one having the nature, such as having the sins destroyed etc , mentioned in the passage of Prajāpati? What proper ? Some opine — Having merely the form of being the knower etc.. Whence ? Because of this Upāsaka, Ātmanah Śarīre Bhāvāt — of the Atman existing in the body, the form is surely to be like that, — and because the accomplishment of the fruit is proper by the association of that much alone. Not indeed, in the case of those that are qualified for the sacrificial rites, and longing for the fruit, heaven etc., what nature the form is in the

तिरेकेण फलानुभवदशायां यादृशं रूपं तादृशं रूपं साधनानुष्ठानदशायामनुसंधातव्यम्, तावतैव साधनानुष्ठानतत्फलयोः सिद्धेरतिरिक्तानुसंधाने प्रयोजनाभावात्। तदविशेषादिहापि तथैव।

नन्नु चात्र

'यथाक्रतुरस्मिँल्लोके पुरुषो भवति तथेतः प्रेत्य भवति'　　(छा. ३।१४।१)

इति विशेषवचनादपहतपाप्मत्वाद्याकार एवानुसंधातव्य इत्यवगम्यते। नैवम्

'तं यथा यथोपासते'　　(मुद्ग. ख. ३)

इत्युपास्यविषयत्वात्तस्येति ॥ ५१ ॥

[462] एवं प्राप्ते, प्रचक्ष्महे—

व्यतिरेकस्तद्भावभावित्वान्न तूपलब्धिवत् ॥ ५२ ॥

न त्वेतदस्ति यज्ज्ञातृत्वाद्याकार एवानुसंधेय इति। अस्यात्मनः संसारदशाया मोक्षदशायां यो व्यतिरेकः सोऽपहतपाप्मत्वादिकोऽनुसंधेयः। अस्य मोक्षदशायां यादृशं रूपं तादृग्रूप एवोपासनवेलायामात्मानुसंधेय इत्यर्थः। कुतः ? तद्भावभावित्वात्—तद्रूपोपपत्तेः।

'यथाक्रतुरस्मिँल्लोके पुरुषो भवति तथेतः प्रेत्य भवति'　　(छा. ३।१४।१)

---

state of experiencing the fruits as distinct from being the knower, that same form can be associated in the state of the performance of the required means; because there is no purpose (point) in associating something over and above (that) when there is the accomplishment of the performance of the required means and the fruit thereof by that much alone. The same thing obtains here also, there being no difference (between the two cases)—

I say (says the objector) — But here, in

'What will (sacrifice) a person has in this world, like that he becomes, having departed from here'　　(Chā. 3·14·1)

— on account of the special mention, it is known that (the Ātman) having the form of one with sins destroyed, etc., alone has to be associated — (We reply) — Not so, because that refers to the object of worship as in

'Him, as he worships'　　(Mudga. Kha. 3)

॥ 51 ॥

[462] This (prima facie view) being reached, we say (in reply) —

Difference, on account of attaining to that nature : but not like the attainment (to that Brahman) ॥ 52 ॥

— It is, however, not so, that the one having the form of being the knower etc., alone, is to be associated. What difference there is in the Ātman in the state of salvation and in the state of worldly existence, that — having the sins destroyed etc., has to be associated. Whatever his form in the state of salvation, Ātman having that form alone is to be associated at the time of worship, — this (is) the sense. Whence ? Tadbhāvabhāvitvāt — on account of attaining to that form. In

'What will (sacrifice) a person has in this world, like that he becomes, having departed from here'　　(Chā. 3·14·1)

'तं यथा यथोपासते तथैव भवति' (मुद्ग. ख. ३)

इति यथोपासनमेव हि प्राप्तिः श्रूयते। न च परस्वरूपमात्रविषयमेवेदमिति वक्तुं शक्यते, प्रत्यगात्मनोऽप्युपास्यभूतपरब्रह्मशरीरतयोपास्यकोटिनिक्षिप्तत्वात्। अतः, प्रजापतिवाक्योदितापहतपाप्मत्वादिगुणकप्रत्यगात्मशरीरकपरमात्मोपासनस्य तथा रूपमेव प्राप्यमित्युक्तं भवति। अत एव

'एवंक्रतुरिहामुं लोकं प्रेत्याभिसंभवितास्मि' (छा. ३।१४।४)

इत्युच्यते। तस्मात्प्रत्यगात्मा प्राप्याकार एवानुसंधेयः। उपलब्धिवत्—ब्रह्मोपलब्धिवत्। यथा ब्रह्मोपलब्धिर्विहिता यथावस्थितब्रह्मस्वरूपविषया, तथात्मोपलब्धिरपि यथावस्थितात्मस्वरूपाविषयेत्यर्थः। कर्मस्वात्मस्वरूपानुसंधानं न कर्माङ्गम्। यजेत स्वर्गकामः, इति कर्मानुष्ठानमेव हि फलाय चोद्यते। देहाद्यतिरिक्तज्ञातृत्वाद्याकारात्मावगतिः कालान्तरभाविफलसाधनकर्माधिकारार्थेति तावन्मात्रमेव तत्रापेक्षितमिति न किञ्चिदपहीनम्। ५२॥

शरीरे भावाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (२१)

'*Him as he worships, he becomes, verily, like that*' (Mudga. Kha. 3)

is indeed mentioned attainment, verily, in conformity with the worship. Nor again is it possible to say that this is just referring to the nature of the Highest; for, even the inmost Ātman also can be included in the category of the object of worship, as he is the body of the Highest Brahman which is the object of worship. Therefore, in the case of the worship of the Paramātman having the inmost Ātman as his body, possessing the qualities, having the sins destroyed etc.. mentioned in the words of Prajāpati — that same form is to be reached— this is a good as said. For this very reason, it is said —

'*Having thus the will (sacrifice), I would be attaining to that world after departure (from this world)*'. (Chā 3·14·4)

Therefore, the inmost Ātman, having the form to be reached is to be associated. Upalabdhivat — like the attainment to Brahman. Just as the attainment to Brahman referring to the nature of Brahman as properly established is enjoined, similarly the attainment to the Ātman, referring to the nature of the Ātman, properly established — this (is) the sense. The association of the nature of the Ātman in the Karmans is not subsidiary to Karman. By (the passage) — one desirous of heaven should sacrifice — is indeed vigorously urged the performance of the Karman itself for the sake of the fruit. The apprehension of the Ātman having the form of being the knower etc., as distinct from the body, is for the purpose of being qualified to perform the Karman which is the means for securing the fruit accruing (later) in due course of time, — and so, that much alone is expected there and hence nothing falls short (in our explanation). || 52 ||

Here ends the Śarīre bhāvādhikaraṇa (21)

अङ्गावबद्धास्तु न शाखासु हि प्रतिवेदम् ॥ ५३ ॥

(अधिकरण २२, सू ५३–५४)

[463] *'ओमित्येतदक्षरमुद्गीथमुपासीत'* (छा १।१।१)

'लोकेषु पञ्चविधं सामोपासीत' (छा २।२।१)

'उक्थमुक्थमिति वै प्रजा वदन्ति तदिदमेवोक्थमियमेव पृथिवी' (ऐ आ २।१।२)

'अयं वाव लोक एषोऽग्निश्चितः' (श ब्रा १०।५।४।१)

इत्येवमाद्याः क्रत्वङ्गाश्रया उपासना भवन्ति । ताः किं यासु शाखासु श्रूयन्ते तास्वेव नियताः, उत सर्वासु शाखासूद्गीथादिषु संबध्यन्ते ? इति विचारः । सर्ववेदान्तप्रत्ययत्वे स्थितेऽपि प्रतिवेदं स्वरभेदादुद्गीथादयो भिद्यन्ते, इति तत्र तत्र व्यवतिष्ठेरन्निति युक्ता शङ्का । किं युक्तम् ? व्यवतिष्ठेरन्निति । कुतः ?

'उद्गीथमुपासीत' (छा १।१।१)

इति सामान्येनोद्गीथसंबन्धितया श्रुतायास्तस्यामेव शाखायां स्वरविशेषयुक्तस्योद्गीथविशेषस्य संनिधानात्तस्मिन्नेव विशेषे पर्यवसानं युक्तमित्येवमाद्यास्तास्वेव शाखासु व्यवतिष्ठेरन्निति ।

एवं प्राप्ते, प्रचक्ष्महे—

But connected with the parts, not (in those) recensions (alone), because with each Veda ॥ 53 ॥

(Adhikarana 22, Sūtras 53–54)

[463]

'One should worship this Aksara Udgītha as Om' (Chā 1·1·1)

'One should worship the five-fold Saman in the worlds' (Chā 2·2·1)

'The people, verily, say Uktham, Uktham — That this Uktha (is), verily, this very Pṛthivī' (Ai Ā 2·1·2)

'This, verily, the world, this fire piled' (Śa Brā 10·5·4·1)

—these and other Upāsanās belong to the parts of the sacrifice — Are those confined only to those recensions where they are mentioned, or are they to be connected with Udgītha etc, in all the recensions ? —This is the consideration (before us) — Although there is the reliability of all the Vedantas, Udgītha etc, are different owing to the difference of accent in each Veda and so they have to be confined to those various places — thus (this) doubt is proper What proper ? They should be confined Whence ? Because this Vidyā which is mentioned as being connected with the Udgītha in a general way in

'One should worship the Udgītha' (Chā 1·1·1)

and as there is the proximity of the particular Udgītha endowed with a particular accent in that very recension it is proper that it should culminate into that particularity alone — so this and other Vidyās should be confined to those very recensions — This (prima facie view) being reached, we say (in reply) —

अङ्गावबद्धास्तु, इति । तुशब्दः पक्षं व्यावर्तयति । न ह्युद्गीथाद्यङ्गावबद्धा उपासनास्तास्वेव शाखासु व्यवतिष्ठेरन्, अपि तु प्रतिवेदं संबध्येरन् । सर्वासु शाखास्वित्यर्थः । हिशब्दो हेतौ । यस्माच्छ्रुत्यैवोद्गीथाद्यङ्गमात्रावबद्धास्तस्माद्यत्रोद्गीथादयस्तत्र सर्वत्र संबध्येरन् । यद्यपि स्वरभेदेनोद्गीथव्यक्तयो भिद्यन्ते, तथापि सामान्येनोद्गीथश्रुत्या सर्वा व्यक्तयः संनिहिताः, इति न क्वचिद्व्यवस्थायां प्रमाणमस्ति । सर्वशाखाप्रत्ययन्यायेन च सर्वासु शाखासु क्रतुरेकः । अतः सर्वासु शाखास्वेकस्य क्रतोः संनिधानात्क्रत्वङ्गभूतोद्गीथादयोऽपि संनिहिता इति नैकस्य संनिधिविशेषोऽस्तीति न व्यवस्था ॥ ५३ ॥

मन्त्रादिवद्वाविरोधः ॥ ५४ ॥

वाशब्दश्चार्थे । आदिशब्देन जातिगुणसंख्यासादृश्यक्रमद्रव्यकर्माणि गृह्यन्ते । यथा मन्त्रादीनामेकैकशाखास्वाम्नातानामपि शेषिणः क्रतोः सर्वशाखास्वेकत्वेन यथायथं श्रुत्यादिभिः सर्वासु शाखासु विनियोगो न विरुध्यते, तद्वदिहाप्यविरोधः ॥ ५४ ॥

अङ्गावबद्धाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (२२)

भूम्नः क्रतुवज्ज्यायस्त्वं तथा हि दर्शयति ॥ ५५ ॥ (अधिकरण २३, सू. ५५)

Angāvabaddhāstu—The word Tu turns away the (above) view. Not, indeed, should the Upāsanās connected with the portions, Udgītha etc., be confined to those recensions alone, but they should be connected with each Veda, that is to say, with all the recensions.

The word Hi gives the reason, — because, they have been connected by the Śruti itself with the limited parts of the Udgitha etc., therefore, where there are Udgītha etc., they are to be connected there everywhere. Although the Udgīthas individually are different on account of the difference in accent, still all the individual (Upāsanās) are relevant, being referred to in the Udgītha-śruti in a general way, — and so, there is no proof for any (special) arrangement anywhere (like the one proposed). And in accordance with the maxim of Sarvaśākhāpratyaya, the sacrifice is one in all the recensions. Therefore, there being one sacrifice pertinent in all recensions, Udgītha etc, that are subsidiary to the sacrifice are also pertinent, — and so, there is no special kind of proximity of any one — thus no confinement (to any particular recension). || 53 ||

And no contradiction, like the Mantra etc. || 54 ||

The word 'Vā is in the sense of and — By the word Ādi are understood genus, quality, number, similarity, order, substance and Karmans. Just as, even though the *Mantras* etc, are mentioned in each one of the recensions separately, the sacrifice which is the principal, being one in all recensions, their application in accordance with the Śruti as far as possible is not contradicted; like that here also no contradiction || 54 ||

Here ends the Angāvabaddhādhikaraṇa (22)

Authoritative nature of the whole, like the sacrifice; to that effect shows the Śruti || 55 ||

(Adhikaraṇa 23, Sūtra 55)

[464] *'प्राचीनशाल औपमन्यवः'* (छा. ५।११।१)

इत्यारभ्य वैश्वानरविद्याम्नाता। तत्र वैश्वानरः परमात्मा त्रैलोक्यशरीर उपास्यः श्रुतः स्वर्लोकादित्यवाय्वाकाशाप्पृथिव्यवयवः। तत्र च द्यौर्मूर्धा, आदित्यश्चक्षुः, वायुः प्राणः, आकाशः संदेहो मध्यकाय इत्यर्थः। आपो वस्तिः, पृथिवी पादावित्यवयवविशेषाः।

तत्र संशयः—किमस्य त्रैलोक्यशरीरस्य व्यस्तस्योपासनं कर्तव्यम्, उत व्यस्तस्य समस्तस्य च, अथ समस्तस्यैव? इति। किं युक्तम्? व्यस्तस्येति। कुतः? उपक्रमे व्यस्तोपासनोपदेशात्। तथा ह्युपदिश्यते—औपमन्यवादयः किलोद्दालकषष्ठाः कैकयमश्वपतिमुपसद्य

'आत्मानमेवेमं वैश्वानरं संप्रत्यध्येषि तमेव नो ब्रूहि' (छा. ५।११।६)

इति पप्रच्छुः। स च तेभ्यः प्रत्येकं स्वोपास्यान्द्युप्रभृतीनुक्तवद्भ्यो मूर्धादिषु व्यस्तेषूपासनं तत्र तत्र फलं चोक्तवान्—

'अत्स्यन्नं पश्यति प्रियं भवत्यस्य ब्रह्मवर्चसं कुले य एतमेवमात्मानं वैश्वानरमुपास्ते मूर्धा त्वेष आत्मनः' (छा. ५।१२।२)

---

[464] Beginning with

'Prācīnaśāla, the descendant of Upamanyu' (Chā. 5·11·1)

the Vaiśvānara-Vidyā is mentioned. There, Vaiśvānara, the Paramātman with the three worlds as his body, with the heavenly world, the Sun, the Wind, the Akāśa, the water and Pṛthivī as his limbs, is mentioned as the object of worship. And there the heavenly world — the head; the Sun — the eye; the Wind — Prāṇa; Ākāśa— Sandeha (the middle of the body, the trunk) — that (is) the sense — Waters, — the bladder; the earth — the feet — (these are) the particular limbs.

There (arises the) doubt — Is the worship to be carried on of this (Paramātman) with the three worlds as his body, divided into parts; or, divided into parts and undivided whole, or as a whole alone? What proper? Of him divided into parts. Whence? In the introduction there is the teaching of the divided individual worship. To the same effect is taught — Having approached (as pupils) Aśvapati of the Kekaya country, Aupamanyava and others with Uddālaka as the sixth, it is reported, asked him —

'You are now studying this Vaiśvānara as Ātman himself: speak unto us, verily, of him'. (Chā. 5·11·6)

and he told each one of them who had told him of their own objects of worship, the heavenly world etc., worship individually, of the head, etc., separately and the fruit likewise in the different cases, in

'He eats the fruit (Anna); sees agreeable things; there is the Brahmanical lustre in his family, who worships this same Vaiśvānara Ātman, this one, the head of the Ātman'. (Chā. 5·12·2)

इति।

'एष वै सुतेजा आत्मा वैश्वानरः'   (छा. ५।१२।१)

इत्यादिना तेषु तेषूपासनेषूपास्यस्य वैश्वानरत्वं चाह। अतो व्यस्तस्योपासनं कर्तव्यम्। परत्र

'यस्त्वेतमेवं प्रादेशमात्रमभिविमानमात्मानं वैश्वानरमुपास्ते'

(छा. ५।१८।१)

इति द्युप्रभृतिप्रदेशावच्छिन्नमात्रे वैश्वानर उक्तस्य मूर्धाद्युपासनस्य समासेनोपसंहार इत्यवगन्तव्यम्।

[465] अपर आह—एवमेव समस्तस्याप्युपासनं कार्यमिति, पृथक्फलनिर्देशात्।

'यस्त्वेतमेवं प्रादेशमात्रमभिविमानमात्मानं वैश्वानरमुपास्ते स सर्वेषु लोकेषु सर्वेषु भूतेषु सर्वेष्वात्मस्वन्नमत्ति'   (छा. ५।१८।१)

इति। न चैतावता वाक्यभेदः। यथा भूमविद्योपक्रमे नामाद्युपासनं तत्फलं चाभिधाय

'एष तु वा अतिवदति यः सत्येनातिवदति'   (छा. ७।१६।१)

इत्यादिना भूमविद्यामुपदिश्य

'स स्वराड् भवति तस्य सर्वेषु लोकेषु कामचारो भवति'   (छा. ७।२५।२)

इति तत्फलं च व्यपदिशति। तत्र भूमविद्यापरत्वेऽपि वाक्यस्य नामाद्यवान्तरोपासनं तत्फलं चाङ्गीक्रियते, तथेहापीति।

And in

'This is indeed the very lustrous Ātman Vaiśvānara'

(Chā. 5·12·1),

etc, he spoke of the object of worship in the various Upāsanâs as being Vaiśvānara. Therefore, the divided individual worship has to be gone through. Elsewhere in

'But he who worships thus this same Ātman Vaiśvānara of the limited measure of a span'   (Chā. 5·18·1.)

it should be understood that there is inclusion in brief, of the worship of the head etc., mentioned in connection with the Vaiśvānara, only limited by the places, heavenly world etc.

[465] Another (objector) says — In this very way, the undivided worship of the whole also should be gone through, owing to the reference to a separate fruit, as in

'But he who worships thus this same Ātman Vaiśvānara, of the limited measure of a span, he eats food amongst all the worlds, amongst all beings, amongst all Ātmans'   (Chā. 5·18·1)

—Not by this much is (produced the blemish,) the splitting of the sentence. Just as in the introduction to the Bhūmavidyā, having mentioned the worship of name etc, and its fruit; having taught the Bhūmavidyā in

'This one talks over-boldly, who talks over-boldly of Satya'

(Chā. 7·16·1)

etc. (the Sruti) also refers to the fruit in

'He becomes self-ruler; in all the worlds, there is free movement at will for him'   (Chā. 7·25·2)

—There though the sentence aims at the Bhūmavidyā, the subsidiary worship of name etc., and its fruit are accepted. Similarly here also—

एवं प्राप्ते, अभिधीयते—

भूम्नः क्रतुवज्ज्यायस्त्वम्, इति। भूम्नो विपुलस्य समस्तस्यैव ज्यायस्त्वं प्रामाणिकत्वमित्यर्थः, एकवाक्यत्वावगतेः। तथाहि—

'प्राचीनशाल औपमन्यवः' (छा. ५।११।१)

इत्युपक्रम्य

'उद्दालको वै भगवन्तोऽयमारुणिः संप्रतीममात्मानं वैश्वानरमध्येति तं हन्ताभ्यागच्छाम' (छा. ५।११।२)

इति वैश्वानरात्मबुभुत्सया, औपमन्यवादयः पञ्च महर्षयस्तमुद्दालकमुपेत्य तत्र वैश्वानरात्मवेदनमलभमानास्तेन च सहाश्वपतिं कैकयं वैश्वानरात्मवेदिनमुपसङ्क्रम्य

'आत्मानमेवेमं वैश्वानरं संप्रत्यध्येषि तमेव नो ब्रूहि' (छा. ५।११।६)

इति पृष्ट्वा तत्सकाशात्परमात्मानं वैश्वानरं स्वर्लोकादिपृथिव्यन्तशरीरमुपास्यमवगम्य तत्फलं च सर्वलोकसर्वभूतसर्वात्मान्नभूतब्रह्मानुभवमवगतवन्त इत्युपसंहारतो वाक्यस्यैकत्वमवगम्यते। एवमेकवाक्यत्वेऽवगते सति, अवयवविशेषेषूपास्तिवचनं फलनिर्देशश्च समस्तोपासनैकदेशानुवादमात्रमिति निश्चीयते।

क्रतुवत्। यथा

This (prima facie view) being reached, it is stated—

'Bhūmnaḥ Kratuvajjyāyastvam— Bhūmnaḥ—of the extensive, of the whole alone, undivided; Jyāyastvam—authoritative nature—that (is) the sense, on account of there being the comprehension of one sentence. To explain the same—

Having introduced (the matter) in

'Prācīnaśāla, the descendant of Upamanyu' (Chā. 5·11·1)

five great sages, Aupamanyava and others, with a desire to know the Ātman Vaiśvānara—

'Uddālaka, verily, Your Reverences, this son of Aruṇa, is studying now this Ātman Vaiśvānara—let us, by Jove, go to him.' (Chā. 5·11·2)

—having approached that Uddālaka, (but) not securing the knowledge of the Vaiśvānara Ātman there; having approached, along with him, Aśvapati Kekaya who knew the Vaiśvānara Atman; having asked him

'You are now studying this same Ātman Vaiśvānara,— speak unto us of the same' (Chā. 5·11·6)

—having understood from him, the highest Ātman Vaiśvānara as the object of worship with his body, *beginning with heaven and ending with the earth*, secured the fruit, the realisation of Brahman, the food of all the worlds, of all beings, and of all the Ātmans — with this winding up, it is known that the sentence is one Thus, when the whole thing is known as one sentence, it can be ascertained that the passage referring to the worship of the particular limbs and the reference to the fruit are merely the repetition of the statement about a part of the worship of the whole.

Kratuvat — like the sacrifice. — Just as in the case of a sacrifice, indeed enjoined, in

वैश्वानरं द्वादशकपालं निर्वपेत्पुत्रे जाते ' (तै. सं. २।२।५)

इति विहितस्यैव क्रतोरेकदेशाः

' यदष्टाकपालो भवति ' (तै. सं. २।२।५)

इत्यादिभिरनूद्यन्ते, तथा समस्तोपासनमेव न्याय्यं न व्यस्तोपासनम् । तथाहि दर्शयतीयं श्रुतिर्व्यस्तोपासनेऽनर्थं ब्रुवती

' मूर्धा ते व्यपतिष्यद्यन्मां नागमिष्य इति ' (छा. ५।१२।२)

' अन्धो भविष्यसि यन्मां नागमिष्यः ' (छा. ५।१३।२)

इत्यादिका । अतः, इदमप्यपास्तं यन्नामाद्युपासनसाम्यमुक्तम् । तत्र हि नामाद्युपासनेष्वनर्थो न श्रुतः । नामाद्युपासनेभ्यो भूमोपासनस्यातिशयितफलत्वं श्रुतम्

' एष तु वा अतिवदति यः सत्येनातिवदति ' (छा. ७।१६।१)

इति, तत एव तत्र भूमविद्यापरत्वेऽपि वाक्यस्य नामाद्युपासनानां सफलानां विवक्षितत्वम् अन्यथातिशयितफलत्वनिमित्तातिवादेन भूमविद्यास्तुत्यनुपपत्तेः । अतः समस्तोपासनमेव न्याय्यम् ॥ ५५ ॥

भूमज्यायस्त्वाधिकरण समाप्तम् (२३)

'One should offer (the offering) to Vaiśvānara, on twelve potsherds when the son is born' (Tai. Sam. 2·2·5)

the parts thereof are repeated

'What is (offered) on the eight potsherds' (Tai. Sam. 2·2 5)

etc, similarly the worship of the whole alone is just reasonable, not the worship of the parts severally. To the same effect points out this Śruti (passage), referring to diaster in the worship of the parts severally —

'Your head would have fallen if you had not come to me' (Chā 5·12·2)

'You would have been blind, if you had not come to me' (Chā. 5·13·2)

etc. So, thus also has been brushed aside (the statement about) similarity of the worship, of name etc., spoken of before, for, there no diaster is mentioned by the Śruti from the worships of name etc, (only) that the worship of Bhūman has a fruit far surpassing that from the worships of name etc., is heard in

'But he indeed speaks over-boldly who speaks over-boldly by Satya' (Chā. 7·16·1)

—For that same reason, though the sentence aims at the Bhūmavidyā, the worships of name etc., together with their fruits are intended to be stated; otherwise, the praise of the Bhūmavidyā by (the mention of) talking over-boldly due to the surpassing fruit, would not be in order. Therefore, the worship of the whole undivided (group) alone is reasonable. ॥ 55 ॥

Here ends the Bhūmajyāyastvādhikaraṇa (23)

नाना शब्दादिभेदात् ॥ ५६ ॥
(अधिकरण २४, सू. ५६)

[466] इह ब्रह्मविद्याः सर्वा ब्रह्मप्राप्तिरूपमोक्षैकफलाः सद्विद्याभूमविद्या-दहरविद्योपकोसलविद्याशाण्डिल्यविद्यावैश्वानरविद्यानन्दमयविद्याक्षरविद्यादिका एकशाखागताः शाखान्तरगताश्चोदाहरणम्। अन्याः प्राणाद्येकविषयफलाश्च। किमत्र विद्यैक्यम्, उत विद्याभेदः? इति संशय्यते।

अत्रैवासां परस्परभेदे समर्थिते सत्येकस्या दहरविद्यादिकायाः सर्ववेदान्तप्रत्ययन्यायः। किं युक्तम्? विद्यैक्यमिति। कुतः? वेद्यस्य ब्रह्मण एकत्वात्। वेद्यं हि विद्याया रूपम्। अतो रूपैक्याद्विद्यैक्यमिति।

एवं प्राप्ते, अभिधीयते—

नाना, इति। नानाभूता विद्याः। कुतः? शब्दादिभेदात्। आदिशब्देनाभ्याससंख्यागुण-प्रक्रियानामधेयानि गृह्यन्ते। शब्दान्तरादिभिरत्र विधेयभेदहेतवोऽनुबन्धभेदा दृश्यन्ते। यद्यपि, वेदोपासीत, इत्यादयः शब्दाः प्रत्ययावृत्त्यभिधायिनः प्रत्ययाश्च ब्रह्मैकविषयास्तथापि तत्तत्प्रकरणोदितजगदेककारणत्वापहतपाप्मत्वादिविशेषणविशिष्टब्रह्मविषयप्रत्ययावृत्त्यवबोधिनः प्रत्यया-

---

Different, on account of the difference of words etc. ॥ 56 ॥
(Adhikaraṇa 24, Sūtra 56)

[466] Here all the Brahmavidyās, having the sole fruit viz. salvation, of the form of acquisition of Brahman; viz. Sadvidyā, Bhūmavidyā, Daharavidyā, Upakosalavidyā, Śāṇḍilyavidyā, Vaiśvānaravidyā, Ānandamaya-Vidyā, Akṣaravidyā etc., belonging to one recension and belonging to other recensions are taken for illustration. There are others having the fruit referring to one subject-matter, Prāṇa etc. It is doubted—Are the Vidyās here one, or are they different?

Here also, when mutual difference in their case is justified, it is reasonable to speak of the reliability of all Vedāntas in the case of Daharavidyā etc. What proper? Vidyās are one. Whence? On account of Brahman, the entity fit to be known, being one The entity fit to be known is the form of the Vidyā. Thus on account of the oneness of form, there is the oneness of the Vidyās—

This (prima facie view) being reached, it is stated (in reply)—

Nānā — manifold Vidyās. Whence? Śabdādibhedāt — On account of difference of words etc. By the word Ādi are to be understood repetition, number, attributes, procedure and names. Here — by other words etc,—the different connecting factors leading to the different entities enjoined are seen. Although the words, — should know, should worship, — etc., which denote the repetition of meditation, and the meditations refer to Brahman alone, still the Vidyās are different, which teach the repetition of meditation referring to Brahman particularised by the attributes, being the sole cause of the world, having all sins destroyed etc., that are mentioned in various contexts, and

वृत्तिरूपा विद्या भिन्दन्ति । ब्रह्मप्राप्तिरूपफलसंबन्ध्युपासनविशेषाभिधायीनि च निराकाङ्क्षाणि वाक्यानि प्रतिप्रकरणं विलक्षणविद्याभिधायीनीति निश्चीयते । अस्मिन्नर्थे

'शब्दान्तरे कर्मभेद'　　(जै सू २।२।१)

इत्यादिभिः पूर्वकाण्डोदितैः सूत्रैः सिद्धेऽपि पुनरिह प्रतिपादनं वेदान्तवाक्यान्यभिधेयज्ञानपराणीति कुदृष्टिनिरसनाय । अतो विद्याभेद इति स्थितम् ॥ ५६ ॥

शब्दादिभेदाधिकरण समाप्तम् (२४)

विकल्पोविशिष्टफलत्वात् ॥ ५७ ॥

(अधिकरण २५, सू ५७–५८)

[467] ब्रह्मप्राप्तिफलानां सद्विद्यादहरविद्यादीनां नानात्वमुक्तम् । इदानीमासां विद्यानां किमेकस्मिन्पुरुषे प्रयोजनवत्त्वेन समुच्चयोऽपि संभवति, उत प्रयोजनाभावाद्विकल्प एव ? इति विशये, किं युक्तम् ? समुच्चयोऽपि संभवतीति । कुतः ? एकफलानां भिन्नशास्त्रार्थानामपि समुच्चयदर्शनात् । दृश्यते ह्येकस्यैव स्वर्गादेः साधनानामग्निहोत्रदर्शपूर्णमासादीनां तस्यैव स्वर्गस्य भूयस्त्वापेक्षयैकत्र पुरुषे समुच्चयः । एवमिहापि ब्रह्मानुभवभूयस्त्वापेक्षया समुच्चयोऽपि संभवतीति ।

---

which are of the nature of meditation repeated And it is ascertained that the passages not depending upon anything else denoting particular Upāsanas, connected with the fruit of the form of acquisition of Brahman — (the passages) mention in every context different Vidyās Although this meaning is established by the Sūtras cited in the First Kānda —

'In difference of words, difference of Karman'

(Jai Su 2 2 1)

etc, the exposition once again here is for the purpose of removing the misconception that the Vedānta-passages aim at the knowledge of the thing mentioned Therefore, it stands that the Vidyās are different. ॥ 56 ॥

Here ends the Sabdādibhedādhikarana (24)

Option, on account of (Vidyās) having unqualified fruit ॥ 57 ॥

(Adhikarana 25, Sūtras 57–58)

[467] It has been stated that Sadvidyā Daharavidya etc, having the acquisition of Brahman as the fruit, are different Now, when there is a doubt in the case of these Vidyās—Is there a combination also, in one and the same person possible on account of some purpose in his case, or option (alternative) on account of the absence of purpose?—What proper? Combination also is possible Whence? Because a combination is seen even of different passages having one and the same fruit although having different senses according to the Sāstra for, a combination together is seen in a person, of Agnihotra, Darsapūrnamāsa etc which are the means of securing one and the same heaven etc, in consideration of that same heaven being extensive; similarly here too, a combination also is possible on account of the consideration of the abundance of the realisation of Brahman —

एवं प्राप्ते, प्रचक्ष्महे—

विकल्पः, एव, न समुच्चयः संभवति। कुतः? अविशिष्टफलत्वात्। सर्वासां हि ब्रह्मविद्यानामनवधिकातिशयानन्दब्रह्मानुभवः फलमविशिष्टं श्रूयते—

'ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति परम्' (तै. २।१)

'स एको ब्रह्मण आनन्दः। श्रोत्रियस्य चाकामहतस्य' (तै. २।८)

'यदा पश्यः पश्यते रुक्मवर्णं कर्तारमीशं पुरुषं ब्रह्मयोनिम्।
तदा विद्वान्पुण्यपापे विधूय निरञ्जनः परमं साम्यमुपैति॥' (मु. ३।१।३)

इत्यादिभ्यः। ब्रह्म हि स्वस्य परस्य च स्वयमनुभूयमानमनवधिकातिशयानन्दं भवति। स च तादृशो ब्रह्मानुभव एकया विद्ययावाप्यते चेत्, किमन्ययेति न समुच्चयसंभवः। स्वर्गादेर्हि देशतः कालतः स्वरूपतश्च परिमितत्वेन तत्र देशाद्यपेक्षया भूयस्त्वसंभवात्तदर्थिनः समुच्चयः संभवति। इह तु तद्विपरीतस्वरूपे ब्रह्मणि तन्न संभवति। सर्वाश्च विद्या ब्रह्मानुभवविरोध्यनादिकर्माविद्यानिरसनमुखेन ब्रह्मप्राप्तिफला इत्यविशिष्टफलत्वात्सर्वासां विकल्प एव। ब्रह्मप्राप्तिव्यतिरिक्तफलास्तु विद्याः स्वर्गादिफलकर्मवद्यथेष्टं विकल्पेरन्समुच्चीयेरन्वा, तासां परिमितफलत्वेन भूयस्त्वापेक्षासंभवात्॥ ५७॥

This (prima facie view) being reached, we say (in reply) —

Option alone, not combination, is possible—Whence? Aviśiṣṭaphalatvāt—On account of having the unqualified fruit—for, in the case of all the Brahmavidyās is mentioned the unqualified fruit — viz. the realisation of Brahman having unlimited excessive joy in the Sruti

'The Brahman-knower secures the Highest' (Tai. 2·1)

'That alone is Brahman's joy, of the learned Brāhmaṇa, not run down by desire' (Tai. 2·8)

'When the seer sees the Puruṣa, golden-coloured, doer, controller, risen from Brahman, then the knowing one, shaking off merit and demerit, stainless, attains to the maximum similarity' (Mu. 3·1·3)

etc., for, Brahman becomes unlimited excessive Ānanda, being realised by oneself, for itself as well as for another. And if that kind of realisation of Brahman is secured by one Vidyā, what (is the use) of another (Vidyā)?—and so, no possibility of combination; for, heaven etc., being limited from the point of space, time, and nature, there is the possibility of abundance from the consideration of space etc., and so combination is possible for one longing for that. But here that is not possible in the case of Brahman whose nature is opposed to that. And all the Vidyās have for their fruit the acquisition of Brahman through eradicating the beginningless Karman and Avidyā opposed to Brahman-realisation; and so there is option itself in the case of all these, owing to their fruit being an unqualified one. But the Vidyās having the fruit other than the acquisition of Brahman, like the sacrificial rites having for their fruit heaven etc., may be taken optionally or combined in accordance with one's will; because they have a limited fruit, there cannot be the expectation of abundance. ‖ 57 ‖

[468] तदाह—

काम्यास्तु यथाकामं समुच्चीयेरन्न वा पूर्वहेत्वभावात् ॥ ५८ ॥

अपरिमितफलत्वाभावादित्यर्थः ॥ ५८ ॥

विकल्पाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (२५)

अङ्गेषु यथाश्रयभावः ॥ ५९ ॥

(अधिकरण २६, सूत्राणि ५९–६४)

उद्गीथादिक्रत्वङ्गेष्वाश्रिता

'ओमित्येतदक्षरमुद्गीथमुपासीत' (छा. १।१।१)

इत्यादिका विद्याः, किमुद्गीथादिवत्क्रत्वर्थतया क्रतुषु नियमेनोपादेयाः, उत गोदोहनादिवत्पुरुषार्थतया यथाकामम् ? इति विशये, नियमेनोपादेया इति युक्तम् ।

ननु चासां पुरुषार्थत्वेनानियमः प्रतिपादितः

(ब्र. सू. ३।३।४१)

इत्यत्र । सत्यम् । तत्र हि

'तेनोभौ कुरुतः' (छा. १।१।१०)

---

[468] There (the Sūtrakāra) says —

But the Kāmya-acts should be combined as desired or not, on account of the absence of the cause mentioned before ॥ 58 ॥

— On account of their having no unlimited fruit — this (is) the sense. ॥ 58 ॥

Here ends the Vikalpādhikaraṇa (25)

In the case of the parts, their presence in what is their resort ॥ 59 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 26, Sūtras 59–64)

When the doubt is — whether the Vidyās resorting to the parts of the sacrifice, Udgītha etc., in

'One should worship the Akṣara Udgītha as Om' (Chā. 1·1·1)

etc., are to be made use of as a rule in the sacrifices, because they are for the purpose of the sacrifice like the Udgītha etc., or as desired, being for some (specific) human purpose like the Godohana etc. — (it is) proper (to say) that they should be made use of, as a rule —

I say (says the objector) — In their case it is propounded that there should be no rule as they serve some human purpose as in (the Sūtra) here,

'Non-rule about meditation on them, on account of that being seen, for separate, non-obstruction indeed the fruit'

(Bra. Sū. III. 3·41)

—True ! In order to make firm that same, it is being taken exception to by pointing out to some indicatory marks, and by reasoning. There indeed, it has been stated that they have a separate fruit owing to no restriction being seen —

'There indeed both function by that' (Chā. 1·1·10)

इत्यनियमदर्शनात्पृथक्फलत्वमुक्तम् । उपासनाश्रयभूतोद्गीथादिवदुपासनानामप्यङ्गतयोपादाननियमे बहवो हेतव उपलभ्यन्ते। न ह्यत्र गोदोहनेन पशुकामस्य प्रणयेदित्यादिवदुपासनाविधिवाक्ये फलसंबन्धः श्रूयते।

'उद्गीथमुपासीत' (छा. १।१।१)

इत्युद्गीथादिसंबन्धितयैवोपासनं प्रतीयते।

'यदेव विद्यया करोति श्रद्धयोपनिषदा तदेव वीर्यवत्तरम्' (छा. १।१।१०)

इति वर्तमानापदेशवाक्यान्तराद्धि फलसंबन्धो ज्ञायते। स्ववाक्येनैवाव्यभिचरितक्रतुसंबन्ध्युद्गीथादिसंबन्धेन निर्ज्ञातक्रत्वङ्गभावस्य वाक्यान्तरस्थवर्तमानफलसंबन्धनिर्देशोऽर्थवादमात्रं स्यात्, अपापश्लोकश्रवणादिवत्। अतो यथोद्गीथादय उपासनाश्रयाः क्रत्वङ्गतया प्रयोगविधिना नियमेनोपादीयन्ते, तथा तदाश्रिताश्चोपासनास्तन्मुखेन क्रत्वङ्गभूता इति नियमेनोपादेया एव ॥ ५९ ॥

शिष्टेश्च ॥ ६० ॥

शिष्टिः, शासनं विधानमित्यर्थः ।

'उद्गीथमुपासीत' (छा. १।१।१)

इत्युद्गीथाङ्गतयोपासनविधानाच्चोपादाननियमः। गोदोहनेन पशुकामस्य प्रणयेत्, इत्यादिवद्विधि-

---

Many points are found to regulate their being also accepted as parts of the Upāsanās, like the Udgītha etc., that are the resort of the Upāsanās. Not indeed, here, as in—For one desirous of cattle should he convey (fire) in the Godohana.— etc. is mentioned the connection with the fruit in the passage giving the injunction about the Upāsanā. In

'One should worship the Udgītha' (Chā. 1·1·1)

is apprehended worship as being connected only with the Udgītha etc. For, from the other passage—

'Whatever alone one does by Vidyā, by faith, by Upaniṣad, that alone becomes more powerful.' (Chā. 1·1·10)

mentioning the existing position, is known the connection with the fruit. *In the case, where being the part of a sacrifice is definitely known in so many* words by the connection with the Udgītha etc., invariably connected with the sacrifice, the reference to the connection with the present fruit in another passage, would merely be a glorificatory passage, like the hearing of the Non-sinful verse. Therefore, just as the Udgītha etc., that are the resort of Upāsanā, being a part of the sacrifice, are made use of as a rule in the performance-procedure (of a sacrificial rite), similarly, the Upāsanās connected with them also are the parts of the sacrifice through them, — and so, they should, verily, be made use of as a rule ॥59॥

And on account of the injunction ॥60॥

Siṣṭi — directive, injunction, — that (is) the sense. There is the acceptance as a rule, on account of the injunction also about the worship as part of the Udgītha, in

'One should worship the Udgītha' (Chā. 1·1·1)

On account of the non-mention of any other qualification in the injunction-sentence as in—For one desirous of cattle should he convey (fire) in the

वाक्येऽधिकारान्तराश्रवणादुद्गीथाद्यङ्गभाव एव हि विधेय इति गम्यते ॥ ६० ॥

समाहारात् ॥ ६१ ॥

'होतृषदनाद्धैवापि दुरुद्गीथमनुसमाहरति' (छा. १।५।५)

इत्युपासनस्य समाहारनियमो दृश्यते । दुरुद्गीथं वेदनविहीनमुद्गीथम् । वेदनहानावन्येन समाधानं कुर्वंस्तस्य नियमेनोपादानं दर्शयति ॥ ६१ ॥

गुणसाधारण्यश्रुतेश्च ॥ ६२ ॥

उपासनगुणस्योपासनाश्रयस्य प्रणवस्य सोपासनस्य

'तेनेयं त्रयी विद्या वर्तते ओमित्याश्रावयत्योमिति शंसत्योमित्युद्गायति' (छा. १।१।९)

इति साधारण्यश्रुतेश्चोपासनसमाहारो गम्यते । तेनेति प्रकृतपरामर्शात्सोपासन एव प्रणवः सर्वत्र संचरति । अत उपासनस्य प्रणवसहभावनियमदर्शनाच्चोद्गीथाद्युपासनानामुद्गीथादिवन्नियमेनोपादानम् ॥ ६२ ॥

[469] इति प्राप्ते, उच्यते—

न वा तत्सहभावाश्रुतेः ॥ ६३ ॥

Godohana — it is known that what is enjoined is the state of being a part alone of the Udgītha etc. ॥ 60 ॥

On account of the putting in order. ॥ 61 ॥

'*From the seat of the Hotṛ, verily, indeed, he puts in proper order the wrong Udgītha*' (Chā. 1·5·5)

— Here is to be seen the rule about putting the Upāsana in order. Durudgītha — Udgītha with the sense not understood. While speaking of the correction by another (the Hotr) when there is the lapse of the Vedana (of the Udgītha), (the Rsi) points out to its acceptance as a rule. ॥ 61 ॥

And on account of the Śruti pointing out to the common nature of the subsidiary ॥ 62 ॥

There being the Śruti passage speaking of a common nature —

'*By that (is) this threefold Vidyā, — Om ; he makes one hear Om, he praises Om (and) he sings Om.*' (Chā. 1·1·9)

common to Pranava, the attribute (subsidiary) of the Upāsana and the resort of the Upāsanā, along with the Upāsana, it is apprehended that there is the inclusion (grouping) of the worship. By the reference to the matter in hand by (the word) Tena, the Pranava has access everywhere along with the Upāsana. And therefore, because the Upāsana is seen as invariably associated with the Pranava, there is the acceptance as a rule of the Upāsanās of the Udgītha etc., like the Udgītha etc. ॥ 62 ॥

[469] This (prima facie view) being reached, it is stated (in reply) —

But not, on account of the non-mention in the Śruti of their association ॥ 63 ॥

न चैतदस्ति यदुद्गीथाद्युपासनानां क्रतुषूद्गीथादिवदुपादाननियम इति। कुतः? तत्सहभावाश्रुतेः। उद्गीथाद्यङ्गभावाश्रुतेरित्यर्थः। अङ्गभावे हि सहभावनियमो भवति। यद्यपि

'उद्गीथमुपासीत' (छा. १।१।१)

इत्यस्मिन्पदसमुदायेऽधिकारान्तरं न प्रतीयते, तथापि तदनन्तरमेव

'यदेव विद्यया करोति श्रद्धयोपनिषदा तदेव वीर्यवत्तरं भवति'

(छा. १।१।१०)

इति विद्यायाः क्रतुवीर्यवत्तरत्वं प्रति साधनभावः प्रतिपाद्यते। तेन क्रतुफलात्पृथग्भूतफलसाधनभूता विद्या

'उद्गीथमुपासीत' (छा. १।१।१)

इति कर्तव्यतया विधीयते। क्रतुफलात्पृथग्भूतफलसाधनतयावगतस्योपासनस्य क्रत्वङ्गभूतोद्गीथाङ्गतया विनियोगो नोपपद्यते। अत उपासनस्याश्रयापेक्षायां संनिहित उद्गीथ आश्रयमात्रं भवति। उद्गीथश्च क्रत्वङ्गभूत इति क्रतुप्रयुक्तोद्गीथाद्याश्रय उपासने क्रत्वधिकारिण एव क्रतोर्वीर्यवत्तरत्वेच्छानिमित्तमिदमधिकारान्तरमिति न क्रतुषु तदुपादाननियमः। वीर्यवत्तरत्वं च क्रतु-

---

But it is not that in the case of the Upāsanās, of the Udgītha etc., they should be included as a rule in the sacrifices, like the Udgītha etc. Whence? Tatsahabhāvāśruteh — On account of the non-mention in the Śruti of their association — that is to say, the non-mention in the Śruti of their being parts of the Udgītha. It is only when there is the state of a subsidiary, there is the rule about mutual association. For, even though some other qualification is not apprehended in this group of words

'One should worship the Udgītha' (Chā. 1·1·1)

still immediately after, in

'Whatever one does by Vidyā, by faith, by the Upaniṣad, that same becomes more powerful' (Chā. 1·1·10)

it is propounded that Vidyā is the means for making the sacrifice more powerful. Therefore, the Vidyā whith is the means for a separate fruit from that of the sacrifice is enjoined for being performed in

'One should worship the Udgītha' (Chā. 1·1·1)

In the case of the worship known as being the means of a different fruit from the fruit of the sacrifice, the practical application as a part of the Udgītha which is a part of the sacrifice is not proper. Therefore, when there is the expectancy for the resort of Upāsana, the Udgītha which is proximate becomes merely the resort. Because Udgītha is a part of the sacrifice, the Upāsana has Udgītha etc., as the resort made use of in the sacrifice; this another qualification caused by a desire to make the sacrifice more powerful, belongs to him alone who is qualified for the sacrifice and so, there is no acceptance of it as a rule in the sacrifices. It has (already) been said that being more powerful in the case of the fruit of a sacrifice means non-obstruction by the fruit of another powerful Karman, — that is to say, the fruit without delay from the sacrifice.

फलस्य प्रबलकर्मान्तरफलेनाप्रतिबन्ध इत्युक्तम् । कतोरविलम्बितफलत्वमित्यर्थः । पर्णतादिनां तु

'यदेव विद्यया करोति तदेव वीर्यवत्तरं भवति' (छा. १।१।१०)

इति विद्यायाः फलसाधनत्ववदपापश्लोकश्रवणादिफलं प्रति साक्षात्साधनभावो न श्रुत इति क्रत्वङ्गभूतजुह्वाद्यङ्गतया विनियोगाविरोधात्तदङ्गभूतानां फलान्तरसाधनभावकल्पनानुपपत्तेस्तत्र फलश्रुतिरर्थवादमात्रं स्यात् ॥ ६३ ॥

दर्शनाच्च ॥ ६४ ॥

दर्शयति च श्रुतिरुपासनोपादानानियमम्

'एवंविद् वै ब्रह्मा यज्ञं यजमानं सर्वांश्च ऋत्विजोऽभिरक्षति' (छा. ४।१७।१०)

इति ब्रह्मणो वेदनेन सर्वेषां रक्षणं ब्रुवती । उद्गातृप्रभृतीनां वेदनस्यानियमे सत्येतदुपपद्यते । अनेन लिङ्गेन पूर्वोक्तानां समाहारादिलिङ्गानां प्रायिकत्वमवगम्यते । अतोऽनियम एवेति स्थितम् ॥ ६४ ॥

यथाश्रयभावाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (२६)

इति श्रीभगवद्रामानुजाचार्यविरचिते
शारीरकमीमांसाभाष्ये तृतीयाध्यायस्य तृतीयः पादः ॥ ३ ॥

In the case of Parnatā (of the ladle) etc., there is not mentioned in the Śruti, their being the direct means in respect of the fruit viz., the hearing of the non-sinful verse, as in the case of Vidyā being the means of the fruit in

'Whatever one does by Vidyā — that alone becomes more powerful' (Chā. 1·1·10)

— and so, on account of the non-contradiction of their practical application, as being part of Juhu etc., that are accessory to the sacrifice, and on account of the impropriety of the idea of the subsidiaries being the means of another fruit there, the mention in the Śruti about the fruit is just mere glorification ‖ 63 ‖

And on account of the Śruti. ‖ 64 ‖

And the Sruti points out that there is, verily, no rule about the Upāsanā being taken up —

'Brahmā, verily, indeed, knowing thus, protects all round the sacrifice, the sacrificer and all the priests (Ṛtviks)' (Chā. 4·17·10)

while talking about the protection of all by the knowledge of Brahman. This is in order when the knowledge of Udgātṛ etc, is not there as a rule. By this indicatory mark is known that the indicatory marks, the inclusion etc., mentioned before are (to be understood) in a general way. Therefore, it stands that there is just no hard and fast rule. ‖ 64 ‖

Here ends the Yathāśrayabhāvādhikaraṇa (26)

Here ends the Third Quarter of the Third Chapter in the Commentary on the Śārīraka-mīmāṁsā composed by the Illustrious Revered Preceptor Rāmānuja,

तृतीयाध्याये चतुर्थः पादः ॥

पुरुषार्थोऽतः शब्दादिति बादरायणः ॥ १ ॥

(अधिकरण १, सूत्राणि १–२०)

[470] गुणोपसंहारानुपसंहारफला विद्यैकत्वनानात्वचिन्ता कृता। इदानीं किं विद्यातः पुरुषार्थः, उत विद्याङ्गकात्कर्मणः? इति चिन्त्यते—किं युक्तम्? अतः, विद्यातः, पुरुषार्थ इति भगवान्बादरायणो मन्यते। कुतः? शब्दात्। दृश्यते ह्यौपनिषदः शब्दो विद्यातः पुरुषार्थं ब्रुवन्

'ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति परम्' (तै २।१)

'वेदाहमेतं पुरुषं महान्तमादित्यवर्णं तमसः परस्तात्।
तमेव विद्वानमृत इह भवति नान्यः पन्था विद्यतेऽयनाय॥' (श्वे ३।८)

'यथा नद्यः स्यन्दमानाः समुद्रेऽस्तं गच्छन्ति नामरूपे विहाय।
तथा विद्वान्नामरूपाद्विमुक्तः परात्परं पुरुषमुपैति दिव्यम्॥' (मु ३।२।८)

इत्यादिः ॥ १ ॥

[471] तत्र पूर्वपक्षी प्रत्यवतिष्ठते—

शेषत्वात्पुरुषार्थवादो यथान्येष्विति जैमिनिः ॥ २ ॥

नैतदेवं यद्विद्यातः पुरुषार्थावाप्तिः शब्दादवगम्यत इति। न ह्ययं

Fourth Quarter of the Third Chapter

Salvation, from this, from Word, thus Bādarāyaṇa ॥ 1 ॥

(Adhikarana 1, Sūtras 1–20)

[470] The consideration about the oneness or manifoldness of Vidyās, involving the inclusion and exclusion of the qualities, has been made. Now is considered—Is salvation from Vidyā or from Karman with Vidyā as subsidiary? What proper? Atah—from Vidyā, there is salvation—thus opines His Holiness Bādarāyana Whence? Sabdāt—there is indeed seen the word in the *Upanisads* speaking of salvation from Vidyā—

'The Brahman-knower secures the Highest' (Tai 2 1)

'I know this Purusa, great, of the colour of the Sun, beyond Tamas, one knowing him thus, becomes immortal here, no other path exists for salvation' (Śve 3 8)

'As the rivers, flowing on, disappear in the sea, abandoning name and form, so, the wise one, freed from name and form, attains to the shining Purusa beyond what is beyond (higher than the high).' (Mu 3 2 8)

etc. ॥ 1 ॥

[471] There the advocate of the prima facie view stands up—

On account of being subsidiary, the statement about salvation, as in the case of others,—so Jaimini (opines) ॥ 2 ॥

It (is) not that the acquisition of salvation from the Vidyā is understood from the Word Not, indeed, this word (passage)

'ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति परम्' (तै २।१)

इत्यादिशब्दो वेदनात्पुरुषार्थावाप्तिमवगमयति, कर्मसु कर्तृभूतस्यात्मनो याथात्म्यवेदनप्रतिपादनपरत्वात्। अतः कर्तुः संस्कारद्वारेण विद्यायाः क्रतुशेषत्वात्तत्र फलश्रुतिरर्थवादमात्रं यथान्येषु द्रव्यादिष्विति जैमिनिराचार्यो मन्यते। तदुक्तम्

'द्रव्यसंस्कारकर्मसु परार्थत्वात्फलश्रुतिरर्थवाद स्यात्' (जै सू ४।३।१)

इति। ननु च कर्मसु कर्तुर्जीवादन्यो मुमुक्षुभिः प्राप्यतया वेदान्तेषु वेद्य उपदिश्यते, इति प्रागेवोपपादितम्

'नेतरोनुपपत्ते' (ब्र सू १।१।१७)
'भेदव्यपदेशाच्च' (ब्र. सू १।१।१८)
'अनुपपत्तेस्तु न शारीर' (ब्र सू १।२।३)
'इतरपरामर्शात्स इति चेन्नासभवात्' (ब्र. सू १।३।१७)

इत्येवमादिभि सूत्रैः। तदेव ब्रह्म

'तत्त्वमसि' (छा ६।८।७)

इत्यादिसामानाधिकरण्येन जीवादनतिरिक्तमित्येतदपि

'The Brahman-knouer secures the Highest' (Tai 21)

etc , points out to the acquisition of salvation from knowledge, on account of its aiming at the propounding of the knowledge of the Ātman as he is, the agent in the case of the sacrificial rites Therefore, because Vidyā is a subsidiary factor to the sacrifice, through the purification of the agent, the statement in the Sruti about the fruit there, is merely a glorificatory statement as in the case of other substances—so thinks the preceptor Jaimini It is said

'In the case of substances (materials) purificatory rites and Karmans, as they are for the sake of another, the Sruti about the fruit would be (only) a glorificatory statement'

(Jai Sū 4·3 1)

But I say (says the objector)—In the Vedāntas is taught (described) the one to be known as fit to be reached by persons desirous of salvation, who is different from the Jiva who is the agent in the sacrificial Karmans—this has already been propounded by the Sūtras

'Not the other, on account of the impropriety'

(Bra. Sū I 1·17)

'And on account of the mention of difference'

(Bra Su I 1·18)

'But not the Individual Soul, on account of the impropriety'

(Bra Sū I. 2 3)

'If (it be argued) he, on account of the reference to the other, (we say)-No, on account of the impossibility'

(Bra Sū I 3 17)

etc , and that same Brahman is (declared) not over and above the Jiva owing to the case-co-ordination in

'That thou art' (Chā 6 8 7)

etc. —this also has been brushed aside by (the Sūtras)—

'अधिकं तु भेदनिर्देशात्' (ब्र. सू. २।१।२२)

इत्येवमादिभिर्निरस्तम् । सामानाधिकरण्यनिर्देशश्च

'ऐतदात्म्यमिदं सर्वम्' (छा. ६।८।७)

'सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्म' (छा. ३।१४।१)

इति चेतनाचेतनसाधारणः

'यः पृथिव्यां तिष्ठन्' (बृ. ३।७।३)

'य आत्मनि तिष्ठन्' (श. ब्रा. १४।६।७।३०)

इत्यादिनावगततत्तदात्मतयावस्थितिनिबन्धन इति

'अवस्थितेरिति काशकृत्स्नः' (ब्र. सू. १।४।२२)

इत्यादिभिरुपपादितम् । तत्कथं कर्मसु कर्तुरात्मनो याथात्म्योपदेशपरा वेदान्तशब्दा इति विद्यायाः कर्माङ्गत्वं प्रतिपाद्यते ? उच्यते—वेदान्तवाक्येष्वेव विद्यायाः कर्मप्राधान्यं सूचयद्भिर्लिङ्गैस्तदुपबृंहितसामानाधिकरण्यनिर्देशेन च वेदान्तशब्दा देहातिरिक्तजीवस्वरूपयाथात्म्योपदेशपरा इति बलादभ्युपगमनीयमिति पूर्वपक्षिणोऽभिप्रायः ।

ननु च कर्तृसंस्कारमुखेन विद्यायाः क्रत्वनुप्रवेशो न शक्यते वक्तुम्, कर्तुर्लौकिक-

---

'*Additional but, on account of the reference to difference*' (Bra. Sū. II. 1·22)

etc. And the reference to the case-co-ordination in

'*All this has this as Ātman*' (Chā. 6·8·7)

'*All this, verily, Brahman*' (Chā. 3·14·1)

common to the sentient and the non-sentient, and which is dependent upon the condition of being the Ātman of the various entities known from

'*Who, abiding in Pṛthvī*' (Bṛ. 3·7·3)

'*Who, abiding in Ātman*' (Śa. Brā. 14·6·7·30)

etc.—this has been reasoned out by (the Sūtras)—

'*On account of the abiding, so Kāśakṛtsna*' (Bra. Sū. I. 4·22)

etc.—So, how could Vidyā be propounded as a subsidiary factor to Karman because the Vedānta passages aim at teaching the Ātman as he is, viz. agent in the case of the sacrificial Karmans?—It is stated (in reply)—The view of the Pūrvapakṣin is that it must be admitted as a matter of necessity, that the Vedānta passages aim at instructing the nature of Jīva as he is, distinct from the body on account of the indicatory marks in the Vedānta passages themselves, indicating that the Karman is the principal with reference to Vidyā, and by the reference to the case-co-ordination fortified by them.

I say (says the objector)—It is not possible to speak of Vidyā as associated with the sacrifice through the purification of the agent, on account of the absence in the case of the agent, of being invariably connected with the sacrifice owing to his being common to (both) popular and Vedic Karmans.—

वैदिकसाधारणत्वेनाव्यभिचरितक्रतुसंबन्धित्वाभावात्। नैवम्। लौकिकस्य कर्मणः कर्तुर्देहादव्यतिरिक्तत्वेऽप्युपपत्तेर्देहातिरिक्तनित्यात्मस्वरूपस्य क्रतावेवोपयोगात्तत्स्वरूपप्रतिपादनमुखेन क्रत्वनुप्रवेशो न विरुध्यते। अतो विद्यायाः क्रतुशेषत्वान्नातः पुरुषार्थः॥ २॥

[472] कानि पुनस्तानि लिङ्गानि यदुपबृंहितसामानाधिकरण्यनिर्देशेन वेदान्तशब्दा जीवस्वरूपपरा इति निर्णीयन्ते ? तत्राह—

आचारदर्शनात्॥ ३॥

ब्रह्मविदां प्राधान्येन कर्मस्वेवाचारो दृश्यते। अश्वपतिः कैकेयः किलात्मवित्तमस्तद्विद्यानायोपगतांस्तानृषीन्प्रत्याह

'यक्ष्यमाणो ह वै भगवन्तोऽहमस्मि' (छा. ५।११।५)

इति। तथा च जनकादयो ब्रह्मविदग्रेसराः कर्मनिष्ठाः स्मृतिषु दृश्यन्ते।

'कर्मणैव हि संसिद्धिमास्थिता जनकादयः।' (गीता ३।२०)

'इयाज सोऽपि सुबहून्यज्ञाञ्ज्ञानव्यपाश्रयः।' (वि. पु. ६।६।१२)

इति। अतो ब्रह्मविदां कर्मप्रधानत्वदर्शनाद्विद्यायाः कर्तुः स्वरूपवेदनपरत्वेन कर्माङ्गत्वमेवेति न विद्यातः पुरुषार्थः॥ ३॥

(The answer is)—Not so, because the popular Karman is possible in the case of the agent although not different from the body, and because the nature of the eternal Ātman distinct from the body is useful only in the sacrifice, its entrance in the sacrifice through the propounding of his nature, is not contradictory. Therefore, Vidyā being subsidiary to the sacrifice, no salvation from it ॥ 2 ॥

[472] What again are those indicatory marks, by reference to the case-co-ordination fortified by which, the Vedānta passages are ascertained to be concerned with the nature of Jīva ?—There says (the Sūtrakāra)

On account of the practical conduct being seen ॥ 3 ॥

In the case of the Brahman-knowers, is seen in a large measure their being busy with the Karmans themselves—Aśvapati of the Kekaya country, indeed, the best of those that know Ātman, said to those sages who had approached him for that knowledge

'I am, indeed, Your Reverences, about to perform a sacrifice' (Chā. 5·11·5)

Similarly also, Janaka and others, the foremost of Brahman-knowers are known in the Smṛti to be devoted to Karman—

'Janaka and others secured all-round perfection by Karman alone' (Gītā 3·20)

'He also performed many sacrifices, the depository of knowledge' (V. P. 6·6·12)

—Therefore, because Brahman-knowers are known to regard Karman as the principal, Vidyā is definitely a subsidiary factor of the Karman by aiming at the knowledge of the nature of the agent—and so, from Vidyā, no salvation ॥ 3 ॥

लिङ्गमिदम्, प्रतिरुच्यताम्, इत्यत्राह—

तच्छ्रुतेः ॥ ४ ॥

श्रुतिरेव हि विद्यायाः कर्माङ्गत्वमाह—

'यदेव विद्यया करोति श्रद्धयोपनिषदा तदेव वीर्यवत्तरं भवति' (छा. १।१।१०)

इति। नेयं श्रुतिः प्रकरणादुद्गीथमात्रविषयेति व्यवस्थापयितुं शक्या, यतः प्रकरणाच्छ्रुतिर्बलीयसी।

'यदेव विद्यया करोति' (छा. १।१।१०)

इति विद्यामात्रविषया हीयं श्रुतिः ॥ ४ ॥

समन्वारम्भणात् ॥ ५ ॥

'तं विद्याकर्मणी समन्वारभेते' (बृ. ४।४।२)

इति विद्याकर्मणोः साहित्यं च दृश्यते। साहित्यं चोक्तेन न्यायेन विद्यायाः कर्माङ्गत्वे सत्येव भवति ॥ ५ ॥

तद्वतो विधानात् ॥ ६ ॥

[473] विद्यावतः कर्मविधानाद्विद्या कर्माङ्गमित्यवगम्यते।

'आचार्यकुलाद्वेदमधीत्य यथाविधानं गुरोः कर्मातिशेषेणाभिसमावृत्य कुटुम्बे शुचौ देशे' (छा. ८।१५।१)

This is (but) an indicatory mark—tell (us) what is arrived at.—Here (the Sūtrakāra) says—

That, from the Śruti ॥ 4 ॥

The Śruti itself says that Vidyā is subsidiary to Karman,

'Whatever one does by Vidyā, by faith, by the Upaniṣad—that alone becomes more powerful' (Chā. 1·1·10)

thus. It is not possible for this Śruti being construed with merely the Udgītha on account of the context; for, the Śruti is more powerful than the context. This Śruti

'Whatever one does by Vidyā' (Chā. 1·1·10)

indeed, refers only to the Vidyā. ॥ 4 ॥

On account of the accompaniment ॥ 5 ॥

'Him Vidyā and Karman accompany' (Bṛ. 4·4·2)

—in this is seen the combination of Vidyā and Karman, and the combination can exist only if Vidyā is a subsidiary factor in the manner mentioned. ॥ 5 ॥

On account of the injunction for one possessed of that (Vidyā) ॥ 6 ॥

[473] Vidyā is known to be subsidiary to Karman, owing to Karman being enjoined upon one possessed of Vidyā. In

'Having returned from the household of the preceptor, having studied the Vedas as prescribed in the spare time after having performed service to the preceptor, to the family, in a clean region' (Chā. 8·15·1)

इत्यादौ वेदमधीत्येत्यध्ययनवतः कर्माणि विदधदर्थावबोधपर्यन्ताध्ययनवत एव विदधाति। अर्थावबोधपर्यन्तं ह्यध्ययनमिति स्थापितम्। अतो ब्रह्मविद्यापि कर्मसु विनियुक्तेति न पृथक्फलायावकल्पते ॥ ६ ॥

नियमात् ॥ ७ ॥

इतश्च न विद्यातः पुरुषार्थः—

'कुर्वन्नेवेह कर्माणि जिजीविषेच्छतं समाः' (ई. २)

इत्यात्मविदः पुरुषायुषस्य सर्वस्य कर्मसु नियमेन विनियोगात्कर्मण एव फलमित्यवगम्यते, विद्या तु कर्माङ्गमिति ॥ ७ ॥

[474] एवं प्राप्ते, प्रचक्ष्महे—

अधिकोपदेशात्तु बादरायणस्यैवं तद्दर्शनात् ॥ ८ ॥

तुशब्दात्पक्षो व्यावृत्तः। विद्यात एव पुरुषार्थः। कुतः? अधिकोपदेशात्। कर्मसु कर्तुर्जीवाद्धेयप्रत्यनीकानवधिकातिशयासंख्येयकल्याणगुणाकरत्वेनाधिकस्यार्थान्तरभूतस्य परस्य ब्रह्मणो वेद्यतयोपदेशाद्भगवतो बादरायणस्य विद्यातः फलमित्येव मतम्।

---

etc., the Sruti enjoining Karmans on one who has studied as known from —Having studied the Vedas—enjoins this upon him alone who has studied right up to the comprehension of the sense. For, it has been established that the study (is to be carried on) till the comprehension of the sense. Therefore, because the Brahmavidyā is also employed in the Karmans, it is not meant for a separate fruit ॥ 6 ॥

On account of the rule ॥ 7 ॥

For this reason also, no salvation from the Vidyā—On account of the whole life of a person knowing Ātman, being employed as a rule in (the sacrificial) Karmans as in

'*(Engaged in) verily, performing Karmans, one should desire to live a hundred years*' (I. 2)

—it is known that the fruit belongs to Karman alone; Vidyā again, is subsidiary to Karman ॥ 7 ॥

[474] This (prima facie view) being reached, we say (in reply)—

But on account of the instruction about the additional (entity), this (view) of Bādarāyaṇa, on account of that being seen ॥ 8 ॥

By the word Tu the (above) view is turned away—Salvation comes from Vidyā alone. Whence? Adhikopadeśāt—on account of the instruction about the Highest Brahman, as fit to be known, which is an additional different entity from the Jīva, the agent in the Karmans, owing to its being the mine of innumerable, surpassing and unlimited qualities that are opposed to every thing fit to be abandoned.—So, the view of His Holiness Bādarāyaṇa is that the fruit (is) definitely from Vidyā.

लिङ्गानि तिष्ठन्तु, वेद्यतयोपदेशास्तु तावत्कर्तुः प्रत्यगात्मनोऽधिकस्यैव। कथम्? तद्दर्शनात्। प्रत्यगात्मन्यशुद्धे शुद्धेऽप्यसंभावनीयानन्तगुणाकरस्य वेद्यस्य निरस्तनिखिल-हेयगन्धस्य स्वसंकल्पकृतजगदुदयविभवलयलीलस्य सर्वज्ञस्य सर्वशक्तेर्वाङ्मनसापरिच्छेद्यान-न्दस्य जीवाधिपस्य कृत्स्नस्य प्रशासितुः परस्य ब्रह्मणो वेदनोपदेशवाक्येषु दर्शनात्

'अपहतपाप्मा विजरो विमृत्युर्विशोकोऽविजिघत्सोऽपिपासः सत्यकामः सत्यसंकल्पः' (छा. ८।१।५)

'तदैक्षत। बहु स्यां प्रजायेयेति। तत्तेजोऽसृजत' (छा. ६।२।३)

'यः सर्वज्ञः सर्ववित्' (मु. १।१।९)

'परास्य शक्तिर्विविधैव श्रूयते स्वाभाविकी ज्ञानबलक्रिया च' (श्वे ६।८)

'स एको ब्रह्मण आनन्दः' (तै. २।८)

'यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते अप्राप्य मनसा सह।
आनन्दं ब्रह्मणो विद्वान्न बिभेति कुतश्चनेति॥' (तै. २।९)

'एष सर्वेश्वर एष भूताधिपतिरेष भूतपाल एष सेतुर्विधरणः' (बृ. ४।४।२२)

Let the indicatory marks stand over. As regards the instruction about something fit to be known, it however refers only to one additional to the inmost Ātman, the agent, for the matter of that. How? Taddarśanāt—on account of that being seen—on account of it being seen in the passages instructing about the knowledge of the Highest Brahman, the mine of infinite qualities impossible to be thought of in the case of the inmost Ātman even pure or impure, which is fit to be known, from which even the taint of what is fit to be abandoned is driven away, whose sport consists in creation, sustenance (glory), and dissolution of the world, created out of its own thought, omniscient, omnipotent, the bliss of which is immeasurable by speech and mind, the over-lord of Jīvas, the Supreman Ruler of everything, in

'Having the sins destroyed, ageless, deathless, bereft of grief, without hunger, without thirst, having the desires fulfilled, having the thoughts fulfilled' (Chā. 8·1·5)

'It reflected—may I be many; may I procreate. It created Tejas' (Chā. 6·2·3)

'Who, omniscient, knower of all' (Mu. 1·1·9)

'His great power is heard as manifold, and natural knowledge, strength (and) activity' (Śve. 6·8)

'He, the one Ānanda of Brahman' (Tai. 2·8)

'From whom words turn back, along with the mind, without reaching (him); one knowing the Ānanda of Brahman, fears not from anywhere' (Tai. 2·9)

'This, the Lord of all; this, the supreme master of beings; this, the protector of beings; this, the bridge, the support' (Br. 4·4·22)

'स कारणं करणाधिपाधिपो न चास्य कश्चिज्जनिता न चाधिपः'
(श्वे. ६।९)

'एतस्य वा अक्षरस्य प्रशासने गार्गि सूर्याचन्द्रमसौ विधृतौ तिष्ठतः'
(बृ. ३।८।९)

'भीषास्माद्वातः पवते । भीषोदेति सूर्यः । भीषास्मादग्निश्चेन्द्रश्च । मृत्युर्धावति पञ्चमः'
(तै. २।८)

इत्यादिषु । तस्माद्विदनोपदेशशब्देषु कर्तुः प्रत्यगात्मनः खद्योतकल्पस्याविद्यादिहेयसंबन्धयोग्यस्य गन्धोऽपि नास्तीति परमपुरुषविषयाया विद्यायास्तत्प्राप्तिरूपममृतत्वं तत्र तत्र श्रूयमाणं फलमिति विद्यातः पुरुषार्थ इति सुष्ठूक्तम् ॥ ८ ॥

[475] लिङ्गान्यपि निरस्यन्ते—

तुल्यं तु दर्शनम् ॥ ९ ॥

यदुक्तं ब्रह्मविदां कर्मानुष्ठानदर्शनाद्विद्या कर्माङ्गमिति तन्न । विद्याया अनङ्गत्वेऽपि तुल्यं दर्शनम् । ब्रह्मविदां कर्मानुष्ठानदर्शनमनैकान्तिकमित्यर्थः, अननुष्ठानस्यापि दर्शनात् । दृश्यते हि ब्रह्मविदां कर्मत्यागः

'ऋषयः कावषेयाः किमर्था वयमध्येष्यामहे किमर्था वय यक्ष्यामहे'
(कौ. २।५)

'He, the cause, the Lord of the lord of the sense-organs; and for him there is no progenitor, nor the lord either'
(Śve. 6·9)

'Under the direction of this Aksara, verily, (O) Gārgī, the Sun and the Moon stay on supported'　(Br. 3·8·9)

'Through fear from him, the wind blows on; through fear rises the Sun, through fear from him, Āgni and Indra also-Death runs on as the fifth'　(Tai 2·8)

etc. Therefore, in the instruction-passages about the knowledge, there is not even the trace of the inmost Ātman who is the agent, almost like a glow-worm, who is associated with things fit to be abandoned like Avidyā etc., and so, the fruit of the Vidyā referring to the highest Purusa, is immortality, of the nature of the attainment to him, which is mentioned in the Śruti in various places. And thus it is well stated that salvation (the human purpose in life, is) from Vidyā. ॥ 8 ॥

[475] The Indicatory marks are also refuted—

But equal is the mention in the Śruti ॥ 9 ॥

As to what has been said that Vidyā is a subsidiary factor of Karman, as the performance of the sacrificial rites is seen in the case of the Brahman-knowers.—That (is) not (so). There is the equal mention in the Sruti of Vidyā not being subsidiary also—That is to say, the mention of the performance of sacrificial rites in the case of the Brahman-knowers is not exclusive, on account of the non-performance also being mentioned. For, the abandonment of Karman in the case of the Brahman-knowers is seen in

'The sages, descendants of Kavasa (said) — Why should we study? Why should we perform secrifices?'　(Kau. 2·5)

इत्यादौ। अतो ब्रह्मविदां कर्मत्यागदर्शनाच्च विद्या कर्माङ्गम्।

कथमिदमुपपद्यते ब्रह्मविदां कर्मानुष्ठानमननुष्ठानं च ? फलाभिसंधिरहितस्य यज्ञादिकर्मणो ब्रह्मविद्याङ्गत्वात्तथाविधस्य कर्मणोऽनुष्ठानदर्शनमुपपद्यते। वक्ष्यति च

'सर्वापेक्षा च यज्ञादिश्रुतेरश्ववत्' (ब्र. सू. ३।४।२६)

इति। फलार्थस्य तस्यैव यज्ञादेः कर्मणो मोक्षैकफलब्रह्मविद्याविरोधित्वात्तस्यैवाननुष्ठानदर्शनमुपपन्नतरम्। विद्यायाः कर्माङ्गत्वे कर्मत्यागः कथमपि नोपपद्यते ॥ ९ ॥

[476] यदुक्तं श्रुत्यैव विद्यायाः कर्माङ्गत्वमवगम्यत इति, तत्राह—

असार्वत्रिकी ॥ १० ॥

न सर्वविद्याविषयेयं श्रुतिः, अपि तूद्गीथविद्याविषयैव,

'यदेव विद्यया करोति' (छा. १।१।१०)

इति यच्छब्दस्यानिर्धारितविशेषस्य

'उद्गीथमुपासीत' (छा. १।१।१)

इति प्रस्तुतोद्गीथविशेषनिष्ठत्वात्।

---

etc. Therefore, because the Brahman-knowers are seen to be abandoning Karman, Vidyā is not a subsidiary factor of Karman.—

How can it be reasoned out that there is the performance of Karman as also the non-performance in the case of the Brahman-knowers?—(The answer is)—Karman, the sacrifice etc., bereft of any consideration of the fruit, being a subsidiary factor of Brahmavidyā, it is appropriate that the performance of that kind of Karman is seen. And (the Sūtrakāra) would state—(the following Sūtra)—

'Expectancy of every thing, from the Śruti about the sacrifice etc., like the horse' (Bra. Sū. III. 4·26)

And as the Karman, the same sacrifice etc., being for the sake of some fruit, is opposed to Brahmavidyā with salvation as the only fruit, it is far more appropriate that the non-performance of just that should be seen. If Vidyā were to be a subsidiary factor of Karman, abandonment of Karman would not be appropriate on any account. ॥ 9 ॥

[476] As to what has been said —that by the Śruti itself is known that the Vidyā is subsidiary to Karman—(the Sūtrakāra) says in that connection—

Not prevailing everywhere ॥ 10 ॥

This Śruti does not pertain to all Vidyās, but pertains to Udgīthavidyā alone. The word Yat the particularity of which is not ascertained in

'Whatever he does by Vidyā' (Chā. 1·1·10)

refers to the particular Udgītha, the matter in hand in

'One should worship the Udgītha' (Chā. 1·1·1)

न हि यत्करोति तद्विद्ययेति संबध्यते।

'यदेव विद्यया करोति ... तदेव वीर्यवत्तरम्'　　(छा. १।१।१०)

इति विद्यया क्रियमाणं यच्छब्देन निर्दिश्य तस्य हि वीर्यवत्तरत्वमुच्यते ॥ १० ॥

[477] यच्चेदमुक्तम्

'तं विद्याकर्मणी समन्वारभेते'　　(बृ. ४।४।२)

इति विद्याकर्मणोः साहित्यदर्शनाद्विद्या कर्माङ्गमिति, तत्राह—

विभागः शतवत् ॥ ११ ॥

'तं विद्याकर्मणी समन्वारभेते'　　(बृ. ४।४।२)

इत्यत्रोक्तेन न्यायेन विद्याकर्मणोर्भिन्नफलत्वाद्विद्या स्वस्मै फलाय समन्वारभते, कर्म च स्वस्मै फलायेति विभागो द्रष्टव्यः, शतवत् । यथा क्षेत्ररत्नविक्रयिणं शतद्वयमन्वेतीत्युक्ते क्षेत्रार्थं शतं रत्नार्थं शतमिति विभागः प्रतीयते, तथेहापि ॥ ११ ॥

अध्ययनमात्रवतः ॥ १२ ॥

[478] यदुक्तम्— विद्यावतः कर्मविधानाद्विद्या कर्माङ्गमिति—नैतद्युक्तम्

'वेदमधीत्य'　　(छा. ८।१५।१)

इत्यध्ययनमात्रवतो विधानात् । न चाध्ययनविधिरेवार्थावबोधे प्रवर्तयति, आधानवदध्ययन-

---

For, what he does,—that cannot be construed with Vidyā. Having pointed out by the word Yat what is being done by Vidyā,—it is said that the same is more powerful, in

'Whatever he does by Vidyā...that same is more powerful'. (Chā 1·1·10)

॥ 10 ॥

[477] And as to what is said that the combination of Vidyā and Karman is seen in

'Vidyā and Karman accompany him'　　(Br. 4·4·2)

and so, Vidyā is subsidiary to Karman —There says (the Sūtrakāra)

Division as in the case of a hundred ॥ 11 ॥

On account of the way of reasoning mentioned in

'Vidyā and Karman accompany him'　　(Br. 4·4·2)

Vidyā and Karman have different fruits; and so, a division should be seen here,—Vidyā accompanies for its own fruit, and Karman accompanies for its own fruit—Śatavat—Just as when it is said that a couple of hundred (cows or coins) goes to the seller of the field and the jewel, it is apprehended that there is this division viz.,—a hundred for the field, and a hundred for the jewel; similarly, here also ॥ 11 ॥

Of one who merely studies ॥ 12 ॥

[478] As to what has been said—because Karman is enjoined in the case of one knowing the Vidyā, Vidyā is subsidiary to Karman—This (is) not right—In

'Having studied the Veda'　　(Chā. 8·15·1)

there is the injunction for one who has merely study (to his credit). Not indeed, does the injunction in respect of study alone make a man turn to the apprehension of the purport, because the study (of the Veda) like the keeping (of the fire), culminates merely in the grasping (understanding) of

स्याक्षरराशिग्रहणमात्रे पर्यवसानात् । गृहीतस्य च स्वाध्यायस्य फलवत्कर्मावबोधित्वदर्शनात्त-न्निर्णयफले तदर्थविचारे पुरुषः स्वयमेव प्रवर्तते । ततः कर्मार्थी कर्मज्ञाने प्रवर्तते, मोक्षार्थी च ब्रह्मज्ञाने, इति न विद्या कर्माङ्गम् । यद्यप्यध्ययनविधिरेवार्थावबोधे प्रवर्तयति तथापि न विद्या कर्माङ्गम्, अर्थज्ञानादर्थान्तरत्वाद्विद्यायाः । यथा ज्योतिष्टोमादिकर्मस्वरूपविज्ञानात्फलसाधन-भूतं तत्कर्मानुष्ठानमर्थान्तरं तथार्थज्ञानरूपाद्ब्रह्मस्वरूपविज्ञानादर्थान्तरमेव ध्यानोपासनादि-शब्दवाच्या पुरुषार्थसाधनभूता विद्या, इति न तस्याः कर्मसंबन्धगन्धो विद्यते ॥ १२ ॥

नाविशेषात् ॥ १३ ॥

[479] यच्चोक्तम्

'कुर्वन्नेवेह कर्माणि' (ई २)

इत्यात्मविदं ज्ञानाद्व्यावर्त्य यावज्जीवं कर्मानुष्ठाने नियमयतीति, तन्नोपपद्यते । कुतः ? अवि-शेषात् । न ह्ययं नियमः फलसाधनभूतस्वतन्त्रकर्मविषय इति विशेषहेतुरस्ति, विद्याङ्गभूत-कर्मविषयतयाप्युपपत्तेः,

'कर्मणैव हि संसिद्धिमास्थिता जनकादयः' (गीता ३।२०)

इतिवद्विदुषस्त्वा प्रायणादुपासनस्यानुवर्तमानत्वात् ॥ १३ ॥

---

the mass of syllables. And in the case of a person who has grasped his own Veda-section, as it is seen that he comprehends the Karman leading and some fruit, he of his own accord proceeds in respect of the fruit ascertained, to the consideration of its meaning. Thereupon, one hankering after Karman proceeds to know Karman, and one hankering after salvation, to know Brahman—and so, Vidyā is not subsidiary to Karman. Although the study-injunction itself directs one towards the apprehension of the purport, still Vidyā is not subsidiary to Karman, because Vidyā is a different thing from the knowledge of the purport. Just as, from the knowledge of the nature of the sacrificial rite, Jyotiṣtoma etc., is a different thing,—the performance of that sacrificial Karman, which is the means of the fruit; in the same way, Vidyā which is the means of salvation, denoted by the words Dhyāna, Upāsanā etc., is definitely a different thing from the knowledge of the nature of Brahman having the form of the knowledge of the purport ; and so, even the tinge of the association with Karman exists not in that (Vidyā) ‖ 12 ‖

No, on account of non-distinction ‖ 13 ‖

[479] As to what has been said that

'Performing Karmans alone, here' (Ī. 2)

having turned away the Atman-knower from knowledge, restricts a person to the performance of Karman as long as he lives—that is not appropriate. Whence? Aviśeṣāt—Not, indeed, is this rule the cause of some special statement, because it refers to an independent sacrificial Karman, which is the cause of the fruit, as the passage could also be regarded as proper, referring to Karman which is subsidiary to Vidyā, as in

'Janaka and others attained indeed to all-round perfection by Karman alone' (Gītā 3-20)

the worship persists also in the case of the wise one right up to his departure (from the body). ‖ 13 ‖

एवमर्थस्वाभाव्येन चोद्यं परिहृत्य

'कुर्वन्नेवेह कर्माणि' (ई. २)

इत्यस्य वाक्यस्यार्थमाह—

स्तुतयेनुमतिर्वा ॥ १४ ॥

वाशब्दोऽवधारणार्थः ।

'ईशावास्यमिदं सर्वम्' (ई. १)

इति विद्याप्रकरणाद्विद्यास्तुतये सर्वदा कर्मानुष्ठानानुमतिरियम् । विद्यामाहात्म्यात्सर्वदा कर्म कुर्वन्नपि न लिप्यते कर्मभिरिति हि विद्या स्तुता भवति । वाक्यशेषश्चैतदेव दर्शयति

'एवं त्वयि नान्यथेतोऽस्ति न कर्म लिप्यते नरे' (ई. २)

इति । अतो न कर्माङ्गं विद्या ॥ १४ ॥

कामकारेण चैके ॥ १५ ॥

[480] अपि चैवमेके शाखिनः कामकारेण ब्रह्मविद्यानिष्ठस्य गार्हस्थ्यत्यागमधीयते

'किं प्रजया करिष्यामो येषां नोऽयमात्मायं लोकः' (बृ ४।४।२२)

इति । विदुषो विरक्तस्य कामकारेण गार्हस्थ्यत्यागं ब्रुवदिदं वचनं ब्रह्मविद्यायाः कर्मानङ्गत्वं दर्शयति । यज्ञादिकर्माङ्गत्वे हि विद्याया विद्यानिष्ठस्य कामकारेण गार्हस्थ्यत्यागो न संभवति । अतो न विद्या कर्माङ्गम् ॥ १५ ॥

Thus having removed the objection by the natural interpretation, (the Sūtrakāra) gives the meaning of this passage

'Performing Karmans alone here' (Ī. 2)

Permission, definitely for praise. ॥ 14 ॥

The word Vā means emphasis.

'All this is enveloped by Īśa' (Ī. 1)

—this being a Vidyā-chapter, this is just permission to perform Karman for all times, for the praise of the Vidyā. On account of the greatness of Vidyā, one although performing Karman always, is not contaminated by the Karmans—thus indeed Vidyā comes to be praised. The remaining part of the passage

'Thus in you, not otherwise from this exists; Karman sticks not to a person' (Ī. 2)

points out to the same—Therefore, Vidyā is not subsidiary to Karman ॥ 14 ॥

And at will, some ॥ 15 ॥

[480] Furthermore, some students of some recension read about a person devoted to Brahmavidyā, abandoning at will the householder's stage of life, in

'What would we do with progeny, for whom there is this Ātman, this world ?' (Br. 4·4·22)

—This statement speaking of the abandonment at will of the householder's life by a wise one who has become free from attachment, points out to Brahmavidyā not being subsidiary to Karman For, if Vidyā were to be subsidiary to Karman, sacrifice etc., the abandonment of the householder's life at will is not possible for one devoted to Vidyā. Therefore, Vidyā, (is) not subsidiary to Karman. ॥ 15 ॥

उपमर्दं च ॥ १६ ॥

पुण्यापुण्यरूपस्य समस्तसांसारिकदुःखमूलस्य कर्मणो ब्रह्मविद्ययोपमर्दं प्रतिवेदान्तमधीयते

'भिद्यते हृदयग्रन्थिश्छिद्यन्ते सर्वसंशयाः ।
क्षीयन्ते चास्य कर्माणि तस्मिन्दृष्टे परावरे ॥' (मु. २।२।८)

इत्यादिकम् । तद्विद्यायाः कर्माङ्गत्वे न संगच्छते ॥ १६ ॥

ऊर्ध्वरेतःसु च शब्दे हि ॥ १७ ॥

[481] ऊर्ध्वरेतस्त्वाश्रमेषु ब्रह्मविद्यादर्शनात्तेष्वग्निहोत्रदर्शपूर्णमासादिकर्माभावाच्च न विद्या कर्माङ्गम् ।

ननूर्ध्वरेतस आश्रमा न सन्त्येव

'यावज्जीवमग्निहोत्रं जुहोति' (आप. श्रौ. ३।१४।८)

इत्याद्विनाग्निहोत्रदर्शपूर्णमासादीनां यावज्जीवाधिकारश्रुतेः, श्रुतिविरुद्धानां स्मृतीनां चाप्रामाण्यात् । अत आह—शब्दे हि, इति । वैदिक एव हि शब्दे ते दृश्यन्ते—

'त्रयो धर्मस्कन्धाः' (छा. २।२३।१)
'ये चेमेऽरण्ये श्रद्धा तप इत्युपासते' (छा. ५।१०।१)

And the destruction ॥ 16 ॥

And in every Vedānta work, students read about the destruction by Brahmavidyā, of Karman constituted of merit and demerit, the root of all misery pertaining to the worldly existence—

'The knot of the heart is broken, all doubts are smashed, and his Karmans are destroyed when is seen that High and Low' (Mu. 2·2·8)

etc. That would not go well, if Vidyā were to be subsidiary to Karman ॥ 16 ॥

And in the case of the celibates; for, in the (Vedic) Word ॥ 17 ॥

[481] Vidyā is not subsidiary to Karman, on account of the presence of Brahmavidyā in the celibate stages of life, and on account of the absence of sacrificial rites like Agnihotra, Darśapūrṇamāsa etc., therein.

I say (says the objector)—There are, verily, no stages of life pertaining to the celibate on account of the Śruti referring to the qualification right up to one's life, for the performance of the Agnihotra, New-moon—Full-moon sacrifices etc., as in

'He performs the Agnihotra, as long as he lives' (Āpa. Śrau. 3·14·8)

—and on account of the unauthoritative nature of the Smṛtis as opposed to the Śruti. Therefore (the Sūtrakāra) says Śabde hi—For indeed, in the Vedic passages themselves they (the stages of life) are seen, in

'The three pillars of Dharma' (Chā. 2·23·1)
'And who these worship Śraddhā as Tapas in the forest' (Chā. 5·10·1)

'एतमेव प्रव्राजिनो लोकमिच्छन्तः प्रव्रजन्ति' (बृ. ४।४।२२)

इत्यादौ । यावज्जीवश्रुतिस्त्वविरक्तविषया ॥ १७ ॥

परामर्शं जैमिनिरचोदनाच्चापवदति हि ॥ १८ ॥

[482] यदिदम्

'त्रयो धर्मस्कन्धाः' (छा. २।२३।१)

इत्यादौ वैदिके शब्द ऊर्ध्वरेतस आश्रमा दृश्यन्ते, अतस्ते सन्त्येवेति—नैतदुपपद्यते, यतः

'त्रयो धर्मस्कन्धाः' (छा. २।२३।१)

इत्येवमादिषु वाक्येषु तेषामाश्रमाणां परामर्शमात्रं क्रियते, अनुवादमात्रमित्यर्थः । कुत एतत् ? अचोदनात्—अविधानादित्यर्थः । न ह्यत्र विधिशब्दः श्रूयते ।

'त्रयो धर्मस्कन्धाः' (छा. २।२३।१)

इत्यादिना हि प्रकृतं प्रणवेन ब्रह्मोपासनं स्तूयते

'ब्रह्मसंस्थोऽमृतत्वमेति' (छा. २।२३।१)

इत्युपसंहारात् । अतोऽन्यार्थमनुवादमात्रमत्र क्रियते तेषामाश्रमाणाम् ।

'ये चेमेऽरण्ये श्रद्धा तप इत्युपासते' (छा. ५।१०।१)

इति च देवयानविधिपरत्वात्तत्रापि नाश्रमान्तरविधिसंभवः । अपि चापवदति हि श्रुतिराश्रमान्तरम्

'Longing for this very world, those who renounce, go away' (Br. 4·4·22)

etc. The Śruti—As long as life lasts—refers to one not freed from attachment. ॥ 17 ॥

Reference (says) Jaimini, on account of the absence of injunction; (the Śruti) indeed condemns ॥ 18 ॥

[482] As to this (statement) that in the Vedic passage—

'The three pillars of Dharma' (Chā. 2·23·1)

etc, the stages of life pertaining to the celibate are seen, and so, they *do* exist—this is not proper. For, in the passages such as

'The three pillars of Dharma' (Chā. 2·23·1)

etc, there is made a mere reference to those stages of life,—that is to say, a mere repetition. Whence this? Acodanāt—that is to say, on account of there being no injunction. There is not to be seen (heard) here an injunctive-word. By

'The three pillars of Dharma' (Chā. 2·23·1)

etc., indeed, is praised the worship of Brahman as Praṇava which is the subject matter, on account of the conclusion in

'One stationed in Brahman goes to immortality.' (Chā. 2·23·1)

Therefore, here is made merely a repetition of the statements a bout those stages of life, for (some) other purpose. As (the passage)

'And these who worship Śraddhā as Tapas in the forest' (Chā. 5·10·1)

aims at the Devayāna-injunction, there also (exists) no possibility of any injunction about other Āśramas. For, on the contrary, the Śruti condemns other Āśramas in

'वीरहा वा एष देवानां योऽग्निमुद्वासयते' (तै. सं. १।५।२)

इत्यादिका । अत ऊर्ध्वरेतस आश्रमा न सन्तीति जैमिनिराचार्यो मन्यते ॥ १८ ॥

अनुष्ठेयं बादरायणः साम्यश्रुतेः ॥ १९ ॥

[483] गृहस्थाश्रमवदाश्रमान्तरमप्यनुष्ठेयं भगवान्बादरायणो मन्यते । कुतः ? साम्यश्रुतेः । उपादेयतयाभिमतगृहस्थाश्रमसाम्यं हि तेषामप्याश्रमाणां श्रूयते ।

'त्रयो धर्मस्कन्धाः' (छा. २।२३।१)

इत्यारभ्य ब्रह्मसंस्थस्तुत्यर्थतया संकीर्तनं गृहस्थाश्रमस्येतरेषां च समानम् । अथ गृहस्थाश्रमस्यानुवादः प्राप्तौ सत्यामेव संभवतीति तस्य प्राप्तिरवश्याभ्युपेयेति मतं तदितरेषामपि समानं, किमन्यत्राभिनिवेशात् ? न च गार्हस्थ्यधर्म एव यज्ञोऽध्ययनं दानं तपो ब्रह्मचर्यमिति सर्वैः शब्दैरभिधीयते, ब्रह्मचर्यतपसोर्गृहस्थस्यैव संभवादिति युक्तम्

'त्रयो धर्मस्कन्धाः' (छा. २।२३।१)

इति त्रित्वेन संगृह्य प्रथमो द्वितीयस्तृतीय इति विभागवचनानुपपत्तेः। अतः

'यज्ञोऽध्ययनं दानम्' (छा. २।२३।१)

'*This one, verily, is the killer of the heroes of the gods, who discards fire*' (Tai. Saṁ. 1·5·2)

etc. Therefore, there are no Āśramas for the celibates—So opines the preceptor Jaimini ‖ 18 ‖

(The other Āśrama) has to be gone through (says) Bādarāyaṇa, on account of the Śruti pointing to similarity. ‖ 19 ‖

[483] His Holiness Bādarāyaṇa thinks that like the householder's stage of life, other Āśramas also have to be gone through. — Whence? Sāmyaśruteh—On account of the Śruti pointing to similarity.—For, in the Śruti is seen even in the case of those Āśramas similarity with the Gṛhasthāśrama, which is admitted as being acceptable. The mention for praising one who is established in Brahman, beginning with

'*The three pillars of Dharma*' (Chā. 2·23·1)

is the same in respect of the householder's stage of life, and the other stages of life. Now, if it is the view that the repetition of the Gṛhasthāśrama is possible only if its existence is already established and so its attainment has necessarily to be accepted; that is equally applicable to the others also; and so, why this partiality for the other one? Not again is it proper that only the feature of the householder's life is denoted by all the words, sacrifice, study, gifts, penance, celibacy etc., in that case celibacy and Tapas would be possible only in the case of the householder, on account of the impropriety of the statement about division—First, Second, Third—after having combined them together, as the Triad in

'*The three pillars of Dharma*' (Chā. 2·23·1)

—therefore, by

'*Sacrifice, study, gifts*' (Chā. 2·23·1)

इति गृहस्थाश्रम उच्यते। अध्ययनशब्दो वेदाभ्यासपरः। तपःशब्देन वैखानसपरिव्राजकयोर्ग्रहणम्, उभयोस्तपःप्रधानत्वात्। तपःशब्दो हि कायक्लेशे रूढः, स च द्वयोरपि समानः। ब्रह्मचारिधर्म एव ब्रह्मचर्यशब्देनाभिधीयते।

'ब्रह्मसंस्थोऽमृतत्वमेति' (छा. २।२३।१)

इति परत्र श्रूयमाणो ब्रह्मसंस्थशब्दो यौगिकः सर्वाश्रमसाधारणः, सर्वेषामाश्रमिणां ब्रह्मसंस्थासंभवात्। ब्रह्मणि संस्था संस्थितिः—ब्रह्मसंस्थत्वम्। तच्च सर्वेषां संभवत्येव। ब्रह्मनिष्ठाविकलाः केवलाश्रमिणः पुण्यलोकभाजः। तेष्वेव ब्रह्मनिष्ठोऽमृतत्वभाग्भवति। तदेतद्विस्पष्टमुक्तं भगवता पराशरेण

'प्राजापत्यं ब्राह्मणानाम्' (वि. पु. १।६।३४)

इत्यारभ्य

'ब्राह्मं संन्यासिनां स्मृतम्' (वि. पु. १।६।३७)

इत्यन्तेन वर्णानामाश्रमाणां च केवलानां ब्रह्मलोकप्राप्त्यन्तं फलमभिधाय

'एकान्तिनः सदा ब्रह्मध्यायिनो योगिनो हि ये।
तेषां तत्परमं स्थानं यद्वै पश्यन्ति सूरयः॥' (वि. पु. १।६।३८)

---

is referred to, the Gṛhasthāśrama. The word Adhyayana refers to the repetition of the Vedic passages. By the word Tapas the Vaikhānasa and the ascetic are to be taken, because both prominently comprise Tapas; for, the word Tapas is used in the sense of the mortification of the body. And that is common to both also. The duties themselves of a Brahmacārin are denoted by the word Brahmacarya. The word Brahmasaṁstha being mentioned in the Sruti later in

'One stationed in Brahman goes to immortality' (Chā. 2·23·1)

is to be understood etymologically and is common to all the Āśramas, on account of the possibility of being stationed in Brahman in the case of the followers of all Āśramas. Brahmaṇi saṁsthā—establishment—establishment in Brahman and that is undoubtedly possible in the case of all. Only followers of the Āśramas deficient in the attachment to Brahman, resort to the holy worlds. And amongst them alone, the one attached to Brahman becomes the enjoyer of immortality. All this has been very clearly stated by His Holiness Parāśara, having mentioned the fruit up to the acquisition of the Brahmaloka in the case of those who are merely attached to the Varṇas and the Āśramas, beginning with

'The world of Prajāpati for the Brāhmaṇas' (V. P. 1·6·34)

and ending with

'The world of Brahman is mentioned in the Smṛti for the Saṁnyāsins (ascetics)' (V. P. 1·6·37)

in mentioning the acquisition of Brahman by those attached to Brahman in

'Those Yogins, indeed, who are always meditating upon Brahman wholeheartedly, for them that is the highest place which the wise ones see.' (V. P. 1·6·38)

इति तेष्वेव ब्रह्मविद्वानां ब्रह्मप्राप्तिमभिदधता ।

अतो गृहस्थाश्रमतुल्या ऊर्ध्वरेतस आश्रमा अपि दृश्यन्त इति तेऽप्यनुष्ठेयाः ।

'ये चेमेऽरण्ये श्रद्धा तप इत्युपासते' (छा ५।१०।१)

इति च, अरण्य इति तपःप्रधानाश्रमप्राप्त्यपेक्षत्वाद्देवयानविधानस्य तत्रापि तत्प्राप्तिरङ्गीकरणीया ॥ १९ ॥

[484] परामर्शपक्षे विधानपक्षे च गृहस्थाश्रमतुल्यमेषामप्यनुष्ठेयत्वमित्युपपाद्य विधिरेवायमाश्रमाणां सर्वेषां नानुवाद इत्युपपादयितुमाह—

विधिर्वा धारणवत् ॥ २० ॥

वाशब्दोऽवधारणार्थे । विधिरेवायमाश्रमाणाम्—धारणवत्—यथा दिष्टाग्निहोत्रेऽधस्तात्समिधं धारयन्ननुद्रवेदुपरि हि देवेभ्यो धारयतीत्यत्रानुवादस्वरूपाऽपि वाक्यादुपरि धारणस्याप्राप्तत्वाद्विधिराधीयते । तदुक्तं शेषलक्षणे

'विधिस्तु धारणेऽपूर्वत्वात्' (जै सू ३।४।३)

इति । तथात्राप्यप्राप्तत्वाद्विधिरेवाश्रयणीयः ।

'ब्रह्मचर्यं समाप्य गृही भवेद्गृहाद्वनी भूत्वा प्रव्रजेत् । यदि वेतरथा

Therefore, the Āśramas also of the celibate on par with the Gṛhasthāśrama are seen, and so they also have to be gone through By Aranye in

'And these who worship Sraddhā as Tapas in the forest' (Chā 5 10 1)

also—because the Devayāna-injunction stands in need of accepting that Āśrama where penance is prominent — there also the attainment to that has got to be accepted ॥ 19 ॥

[484] Having propounded that in the reference-view, and the injunction-view, these (Āśramas) also have to be gone through equally with the Gṛhasthāśrama —(the Sūtrakara) now says in order to propound that there is the injunction alone of all the Āśramas, not merely repetition—

Injunction definitely, like carrying ॥ 20 ॥

The word Va is for emphasis This is indeed an injunction of all the Āśramas as in the case of Dhārana—Just as in the Distāgnihotra-sacrifice from the passage—Carrying the Samidh down, he should follow on swiftly, for, he carries it above for the Gods—although it is of the nature of a mere repetition an injunction is enjoined, on account of the carrying above not known before That is said in (the chapter) *Śesalaksana*

'(There is) however the injunction for carrying, for that is unknown before' (Jai Su 3 4 3)

Similarly here also, on account of the thing not being established before, an injunction alone has got to be accepted, like the injunction about the Āśramas in respect of the Jābālas taking it to be as though not being there in

'Having completed the celibacy-stage one should become a householder; leaving the house, having become a forester, (one) should

ब्रह्मचर्यादेव प्रव्रजेद्गृहाद्वा वनाद्वा । यदहरेव विरजेत्तदहरेव प्रव्रजेत्' (जा. ४)
इति जाबालानामाश्रमविधिमसन्तमिव कृत्वैतेष्वन्यपरेष्वपि वाक्येष्वाश्रमप्राप्तिरवश्याश्रयणीया, इत्युपपादितम् ।

एवमाश्रमान्तरविधानादृणश्रुतिर्यावज्जीवश्रुतिरपवादश्रुतिश्चाविरक्तविषया एवेति वेदितव्याः। अन्याश्च ब्रह्मविदः कर्मणामाप्रयाणादवश्यकर्तव्यताविधायिन्यः श्रुतयः स्मृतयश्च स्वस्वाश्रमधर्मविषयाः । अत ऊर्ध्वरेतःसु च ब्रह्मविद्याविधानाद्विद्यातः पुरुषार्थ इति सिद्धम् ॥२०॥

पुरुषार्थाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (१)

स्तुतिमात्रमुपादानादिति चेन्नापूर्वत्वात् ॥ २१ ॥

(अधिकरण २, सू. २१–२२)

[485] इदमिदानीं चिन्त्यते—

'स एष रसानां रसतमः परमः परार्ध्योऽष्टमो य उद्गीथः'

(छा. १।१।३)

इत्येवंजातीयकानि वाक्यानि क्रत्ववयवभूतोद्गीथादिस्तुतिमात्रपराणि, आहोस्विदुद्गीथादिषु

---

renounce; or otherwise too, one should renounce right from the Brahmacarya, or from the house, or from the forest. The very day one gets disgusted, the same day one should renounce'

(Jā. 4)

even in the case of these and other passages referring to other Āśramas, the establishment of the Āśramas has got to be accepted — this has been propounded.

Thus on account of the definite statement (injunction) about the other Āśramas, the Sruti about the debt, the Sruti—Yāvajjīva (for all life)—the Śruti condemnatory—all these are to be known as referring to those alone that are not free from attachment; other Śrutis enjoining Karmans to be necessarily gone through right up to departure (from the body), by the Brahman-knowers, and the Smṛtis also refer to the particular Āśrama-duties in their respective cases. Therefore, on account of the prescription of Brahmavidyā in the case of the celibates, it is established that there is salvation from Vidyā. ॥ 20 ॥

Here ends the Puruṣārthādhikaraṇa (1)

If (it be said) merely praise on account of the inclusion (the answer is)—No, on account of the thing being not (mentioned) before. ॥ 21 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 2, Sūtras 21–22)

[485] This is now considered—

'This one, he is the most eminent Rasa of all Rasas, the highest, infinite, the eighth, what the Udgītha' (Chā. 1·1·3)

(passages) such as these—Do these aim at merely the praise of Udgītha etc., which are the parts of the sacrifice; or, are they for the purpose of prescribing superimposition of the idea of being the most eminent Rasa etc., in the case of

रसतमादिदृष्टिविधानार्थानीति । अत्र प्रतिपादितमुपासनपरत्वमङ्गीकृत्योपासनस्य पुरुषार्थत्वेन क्रतुषूपादानानियम उक्तः । किं युक्तम् ? स्तुतिमात्रपराणीति । कुतः ? उद्गीथाद्युपादानात् । क्रत्वङ्गभूतानि ह्युद्गीथादीन्युपादाय तेषां रसतमादित्वं प्रतिपादितम् । यथा जुह्वादीनां पृथिव्यादित्वं प्रतिपादयतो वचनस्य—इयमेव जुहूः स्वर्गो लोक आहवनीयः, इत्यादिकस्य तत्स्तुतिमात्रपरत्वं तथेहापि । तदिदमाशङ्क्यते—स्तुतिमात्रमुपादानादिति चेत्, इति । उद्गीथाद्युपादानात्तत्स्तुतिमात्रमेवैषां वाक्यानां विवक्षितमिति चेत्—

अत्रोत्तरम्—नापूर्वत्वात्, इति । न स्तुतिमात्रत्वमुपपद्यते । कुतः ? अपूर्वत्वात्—अप्राप्तत्वात् । न ह्युद्गीथादयो रसतमादितया प्रमाणान्तरेण प्रतिपन्ना येन तत्प्राशस्त्यबुद्ध्युत्पत्त्यर्थं रसतमादित्वेनानूद्येरन् । न चोद्गीथादिविधिरत्र संनिहितो येन, इयमेव जुहूः स्वर्गो लोक आहवनीयः—इत्यादिवत्तदेकवाक्यत्वेन यया कयाचिद्विधया तत्स्तुतिपरत्वमाश्रीयेत । अतः क्रतुवीर्यवत्त्वादिफलसिद्ध्यर्थमुद्गीथादिषु रसतमादिदृष्टिविधानमेव न्याय्यम् ॥ २१ ॥

भावशब्दाच्च ॥ २२ ॥

Udgītha and others? Here, having admitted that the propounding aims at the worship, and worship being for the sake of salvation, it was stated that there was no rule about the worship being included in the sacrifices. — What proper? The passages aim at mere praise. Whence? On account of the inclusion of Udgītha and others, for, having admitted Udgītha and others which are the limbs of the sacrifice, their being the most eminent Rasa etc., is set forth. Just as in the case of the statement advocating the ladle and others as being the earth and others, (the statement) — This same, ladle; the heavenly world, the Āhavanīya (fire) etc, — aims merely at its praise, similarly here also. So, this is the doubt raised — Stutimātramupādānāditi cet —If it be argued that on account of the inclusion of Udgītha etc., it is intended to say that these passages are merely for the sake of their praise —

Here (is) the answer — Nāpūrvatvāt — it is not reasonable that (the passages are) merely for praise. Whence? Apūrvatvāt — on account of their being not (proved, seen) before. Not indeed, are Udgītha and others apprehended as being the most eminent Rasa etc., by another means of proof, so that (statements about) their being the most eminent Rasa etc., would be repeated for producing the idea of being praiseworthy. Nor again is any injunction about Udgītha etc., nearby here, so that like (the passage) —This same, ladle; the heavenly world, the Āhavanīya (fire) etc., — that could be accepted as aiming at their praise, in some manner or other, on account of its forming up one sentence. Therefore, it is reasonable that there should be the prescription of superimposition as being the most eminent Rasa etc, on the Udgītha etc., for the purpose of the accomplishment of the fruit, the possession of power by the sacrifice etc. ॥21॥

On account of the word denoting the optative ॥22॥

'उपासीत' (छा. १।१।१)
इत्यादिभावशब्दाच्च विधिपरत्वमेव न्याय्यम्। विधिप्रत्यययुक्तो हि क्रियाशब्दो विधेयमेव स्वार्थमवगमयति। तस्मादुपासनविधानार्था एताः श्रुतयः॥ २२॥

स्तुतिमात्राधिकरणं समाप्तम् (२)

पारिप्लवार्था इति चेन्न विशेषितत्वात् ॥ २३॥
(अधिकरण ३, सू. २३–२४)

[486]

'*प्रतर्दनो ह वै दैवोदासिरिन्द्रस्य प्रियं धामोपजगाम*' (कौ. ३।१)
'*श्वेतकेतुर्हारुणेय आस*' (छा. ६।१।१)

इत्येवमादीनि वेदान्तेष्वाख्यानानि किं पारिप्लवप्रयोगार्थानि, उत विद्याविशेषप्रतिपादनार्थानि? इति चिन्तायाम्, आख्यानानि शंसन्ति, इत्याख्यानानां पारिप्लवे विनियोगान्न विद्याप्रधानत्वं न्याय्यमिति चेत्–न। सर्वाण्याख्यानानि पारिप्लवप्रयोगे न विनियोगमर्हन्ति। कुतः? विशेषितत्वाद्विनियोगस्य। आख्यानानि शंसन्ति, इत्युक्त्वा तत्रैव, मनुर्वैवस्वतो राजा,

---

And on account of the word denoting the optative mood, in
'*One should worship*' (Chā. 1·1·1)
it is reasonable that it should aim at injunction; for, a word denoting an action, endowed with an injunctive termination makes one comprehend its sense which is the object of the injunction itself. Therefore, these Sruti passages are for the purpose of enjoining worship. || 22 ||

Here ends the Stutimātrādhikaraṇa (2)

If (it be said) they are for the Pāriplava, (the answer is)–No, on account of that being specialised || 23 ||

(Adhikaraṇa 3, Sūtras 23-24)

[486] The legendary discourses in the Vedāntas such as
'*Pratardana, verily, the son of Divodāsa, indeed, went to the dear abode of Indra*' (Kau. 3·1)
'*Śvetaketu, indeed, was the descendant of Aruṇa*' (Chā. 6·1·1)
— Are these legends (episodes) etc., for the purpose of employment in the revolving legends, or for the purpose of propounding a particular Vidyā?— While considering this, if it be argued that because the legendary discourses are employed in the Pāriplavas (revolving legends) in (the passages)—They narrate the episodes — it is not reasonable that they should be prominently for Vidyā—(we say) — No, all legendary discourses cannot be employed in the Pāriplava procedure. Whence? Because the practical application is specialised. Having stated—They narrate the episodes,— in that same place the legends about Manu and others — Manu, the son of Vivasvat, the King — are specialised. Therefore, it is known that they alone are to be employed there. Therefore, the Sruti passages dealing with the legendary discourses in

इत्यादिना मन्वादीनामाख्यानानि विशेष्यन्ते। अतस्तेषामेव तत्र विनियोग इति गम्यते। तस्मान्न सर्ववेदान्तेष्वाख्यानश्रुतयः पारिप्लवप्रयोगार्थाः, अपि तु विद्याविध्यर्थाः ॥ २३ ॥

तथा चैकवाक्योपबन्धात् ॥ २४ ॥

'आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यः' (बृ. २।४।५)

इत्यादिविधिनैकवाक्यतयोपबन्धाद्याख्यानानां विद्याविध्यर्थान्येव तानीति गम्यते। यथा

'सोऽरोदीत्' (तै. सं. १।५।१)

इत्येवमादेः कर्मविध्यर्थत्वं न पारिप्लवार्थत्वम् ॥ २४ ॥

पारिप्लवाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (३)

अत एव चाग्नीन्धनाद्यनपेक्षा ॥ २५ ॥

(अधिकरण ४, सू. २५)

[487] स्तुतिप्रसङ्गादवान्तरसंगतिविशेषेणार्थद्वयं चिन्तितम्। विद्यावन्त ऊर्ध्वरेतस आश्रमिणः सन्तीत्युक्तम्

'ऊर्ध्वरेतःसु च शब्दे हि' (ब्र. सू. ३।४।१७)

इत्यादिभिः सूत्रैः। इदानीमूर्ध्वरेतसो यज्ञाद्यभावात्तदङ्गिका विद्या न संभवतीत्याशङ्क्याह— अत एव चाग्नीन्धनाद्यनपेक्षा, इति। यत ऊर्ध्वरेतस आश्रमिणो विद्यासंबन्धित्वेन श्रुत्या

all the Vedāntas, are not for the sake of the Pāriplava-procedure, but for the purpose of enjoining a Vidyā ॥ 23 ॥

And likewise on account of forming up one sentence ॥ 24 ॥

And because the legendary discourses are connected as forming one sentence with the injunction in

'Ātman, verily, (O) dear one, should be seen' (Br. 2·4·5)

etc., it is known that they are for the sake of the injunction of the Vidyā alone. Just as (the passage)

'He wept' (Tai. Saṁ. 1·5·1)

etc., are for the sake of an injunction about some action, not for the sake of the Pāriplavas ॥ 24 ॥

Here ends the Pāriplavādhikaraṇa (3)

And for this very reason, no need of keeping the fire etc. ॥ 25 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 4, Sūtra 25)

[487] In passing, two matters have been considered, while discussing the question of praise, related to some indirect connection. It is stated in the Sūtras—

'And in the case of the celibates; for, in the (Vedic) word' (Bra. Sū. III. 4·17)

etc., that there are the followers of the celibate stage of life, possessed of Vidyā.

Now a doubt being there—Because there is the absence of the sacrifice etc., in the case of the celibates, Vidyā which is subsidiary to that is not possible, — (The Sūtrakāra) says — Ataḥ eva cāgnīndhanādyanapekṣā — Because the celibate followers of the Āśramas are admitted by the

परिगृह्यन्ते—

'ब्रह्मसंस्थोऽमृतत्वमेति' (छा २।२३।१)

'ये चेमेऽरण्ये श्रद्धा तप इत्युपासते' (छा ५।१०।१)

'एतमेव प्रव्राजिनो लोकमिच्छन्त प्रव्रजन्ति' (बृ ४।४।२२)

'यदिच्छन्तो ब्रह्मचर्यं चरन्ति' (का २।१५)

इत्यादिकया, अत एवोर्ध्वरेत सु विद्याग्नीन्धनाद्यनपेक्षा। अग्नीन्धनम्—अग्न्याधानम्। आधान पूर्वकाग्निहोत्रदर्शपूर्णमासादिकर्मानपेक्षा, तेषु विद्या केवलस्वाश्रमविहितकर्मापेक्षेत्यर्थ ॥ २५॥

अग्नीन्धनाद्यधिकरण समाप्तम् (४)

सर्वापेक्षा च यज्ञादिश्रुतेरश्ववत् ॥ २६ ॥

(अधिकरण ५, सू २६)

[488] यदि विद्या यज्ञाद्यनपेक्षैवामृतत्वं साधयति तर्हि गृहस्थेष्वपि तदनपेक्षैव साधयितुमर्हति। यज्ञादिश्रुतिरपि

'विविदिषन्ति' (बृ ४।४।२२)

इति शब्दात्कर्मणो वेदनाङ्गतां न प्रतिपादयति। अत आह सर्वापेक्षा, इति। अग्निहोत्रादिसर्वकर्मापेक्षैव विद्या कर्मवत्सु गृहस्थेषु। कुत ? यज्ञादिश्रुते।

Sruti as having connection with the Vidyā in

'One stationed in Brahman goes to immortality' (Chā 2 23 1)

'And these who worship Sraddhā as Tapas in the forest' (Chā 5 10 1)

'The renouncers (ascetics) longing for this very world, go away' (Br 4 4 22)

'Longing for which, they practise celibacy' (Kā 2 15)

etc for this very reason in the case of the celibates there is no need for the Vidyā, of the kindling of the fire etc Agnīndhana—keeping up the fire There is no need for the rites such as the Agnihotra, Darśapūrnamāsa (New and Full moon-sacrifices) etc, preceded by the keeping up of the fire that is to say, in their case Vidyā expects the Karman prescribed only for their own Āśrama ‖ 25 ‖

Here ends the Agnīndhanādyadhikarana (4)

And the need of all, like the horse, on account of the Śruti referring to the sacrifice etc. ‖ 26 ‖

(Adhikarana 5, Sūtra 26)

[488] If Vidyā leads on to immortality, verily, without standing in need of the sacrifice etc, then in the case of the house-holder also, it deserves to accomplish the same without standing in need of that (Yajña etc,) itself The Sruti passage referring to the sacrifice etc, does not propound Karman as subsidiary to knowledge from the expression

'They desire to know.' (Br 4 4 22)

Therefore (the Sutrakāra) says—Sarvāpeksā The Vidyā does stand in need of all Karmans, Agnihotra etc in the case of the house-holders who perform sacrificial rites Whence? Yajñādiśrutah—

'तमेतं वेदानुवचनेन ब्राह्मणा विविदिषन्ति यज्ञेन दानेन तपसानाशकेन'
(बृ. ४।४।२२)

इत्यादिना यज्ञादयो हि विद्याङ्गत्वेन श्रूयन्ते। यज्ञादिना विविदिषन्ति—वेदितुमिच्छन्ति—यज्ञादिभिर्वेदनं प्राप्तुमिच्छन्तीत्यर्थः। यज्ञादीनां ज्ञानसाधनत्वे सत्येव यज्ञादिभिर्ज्ञानं प्राप्तुमिच्छन्तीति व्यपदेश उपपद्यते, यथासेर्हननसाधनत्वे सति असिना जिघांसतीति व्यपदेशः। अतो यज्ञादीनां ज्ञानसाधनत्वमवगम्यते। ज्ञानं च वाक्यार्थज्ञानादर्थान्तरभूतं ध्यानोपासनादिशब्दवाच्यं विशदतमप्रत्यक्षतापन्नस्मृतिरूपं निरतिशयप्रियमहरहरभ्यासाधेयातिशयम्, आ प्रयाणादनुवर्तमानं मोक्षसाधनमित्युक्तमस्माभिः पूर्वमेव। वक्ष्यति च

'आवृत्तिरसकृदुपदेशात्' (ब्र. सू. ४।१।१)

इत्यादिना। एवंरूपं च ध्यानमहरहरनुष्ठीयमानैर्नित्यनैमित्तिकैः कर्मभिः परमपुरुषाराधनरूपैः परमपुरुषप्रसादद्वारेण जायते, इति यज्ञादिना विविदिषन्तीति शास्त्रेण प्रतिपाद्यते। अतः कर्मवत्सु गृहस्थेषु यज्ञादिनित्यनैमित्तिकसर्वकर्मापेक्षा विद्या।

'Him, this one, the Brāhmanas in accordance with the statement in the Vedas, desire to know, by the sacrifice, gifts, Tapas, indestructible' (Br. 4·4·22)

by this etc., sacrifice and others are indeed mentioned in the Śruti as subsidiary to Vidyā—By sacrifice etc., Vividisanti—desire to know; that is to say, they desire to secure knowledge by sacrifice etc. It is only when sacrifices etc., are (admitted to be) the means of knowledge, the reference viz. they desire to secure knowledge by sacrifice etc., becomes appropriate: as when the sword is (known to be) the means of killing, there can be the statement—He wishes to kill by the sword. Therefore, sacrifice etc , are apprehended as the means of knowledge. And that knowledge, a different matter from the knowledge of the sense of the passages, denoted by the words Dhyāna (meditation), Upāsanā (worship) etc., of the form of remembrance attaining to the nature of the clearest direct perception, exceedingly agreeable, with its abundance increasing day by day by practice, persisting right up to the departure (from the body)—such knowledge is the means of salvation—(this) is stated by us already. (The Sūtrakāra) would speak of this in

'Repetition, on account of the instruction more than once.'
(Bra. Sū. IV. 1·1)

etc. And that contemplation of this nature is produced by sacrificial rites being practised day by day — both obligatory and occasional — of the nature of the worship of the highest Puruṣa, through the grace of the highest Puruṣa —This is propounded by the Śāstra — They desire to know by sacrifice etc. —Therefore, in the case of the house-holders performing the sacrificial Karman, Vidyā stands in need of all rites, obligatory and occasional, such as sacrifice etc.

अश्ववत्—यथा पुरुषगमनसाधनभूतोऽश्वः स्वपरिकरबन्धपरिकर्मापेक्षः, एवं मोक्ष-साधनभूतापि विद्या नित्यनैमित्तिककर्मपरिकरापेक्षा। तदिदमाह स्वयमेव भगवान्

'यज्ञो दानं तपः कर्म न त्याज्यं कार्यमेव तत्।
यज्ञो दानं तपश्चैव पावनानि मनीषिणाम्॥' (गीता १८।५)
'यतः प्रवृत्तिर्भूतानां येन सर्वमिदं ततम्।
स्वकर्मणा तमभ्यर्च्य सिद्धिं विन्दति मानवः॥' (गीता १८।४६)

इति॥ २६॥

सर्वापेक्षाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (५)

शमदमाद्युपेतः स्यात्तथापि तु तद्विधेस्तदङ्गतया तेषामप्यवश्यानुष्ठेयत्वात्॥ २७॥

(अधिकरण ६, सू. २७)

[489] गृहस्थस्य शमदमादीन्यप्यनुष्ठेयानि, उत नेति चिन्तायामान्तरबाह्यकरणव्यापाररूपत्वात्कर्मानुष्ठानस्य, शमदमादीनां तद्विपरीतरूपत्वाच्चाननुष्ठेयानि, इति प्राप्ते, उच्यते—यद्यपि गृहस्थः करणव्यापाररूपकर्मसु प्रवृत्तस्तथापि स विद्वाञ्छमदमाद्युपेतः स्यात्।

Aśvavat — Just as a horse that is the means of movement in the case of a man, stands in need of accessory acts such as tightening up its saddle, the bridle, so Vidyā although the means of salvation stands in need of the obligatory and occasional Karmans, and their paraphernalia—All this the Lord himself says—

'Sacrifice, gifts, penance, (sacrificial) Karman, — (all that) should not be abandoned; that should be, verily, gone through. Sacrifice, gifts and penance — these surely (are) the purifiers in the case of the wise ones' (Gītā 18·5)

'From whom is the activity of creatures, by whom all this is spread out, — having worshipped him by one's prescribed Karman one secures perfection.' (Gītā 18·46)

॥ 26 ॥

Here ends the Sarvāpekṣādhikaraṇa (5)

He may be endowed with tranquillity, restraint, etc., still however, that being enjoined as being subsidiary to that, they are necessarily to be gone through ॥ 27 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 6, Sūtra 27)

[489] While considering the question in the case of the house-holder, tranquillity, restraint etc.,—are these to be practised or not?—(the prima facie view) being reached—because the performance of a rite is of the nature of operation by internal and external sense-organs; Śama, Dama etc., being of an opposite nature, they are not to be performed—it is stated (in reply)—Although the house-holder is engaged in the acts involving the operations of the sense-organs, he may be a wise one endowed with tranquillity,

कुतः ? तदङ्गतया तद्विधेः — विद्याङ्गतया तेषां विधेः

'तस्मादेवंविद् शान्तो दान्त उपरतस्तितिक्षुः समाहितो भूत्वात्मन्येवात्मानं पश्येद्' (बृ ४।४।२३)

इति। विद्योत्पत्तेश्चित्तसमाधानरूपत्वेन दृष्टपरिकरत्वाच्छमदमादीनां विद्यानिर्वृत्तये तेषां शमदमादीनामवश्यानुष्ठेयत्वाच्च तान्यप्यनुष्ठेयानि। न च करणव्यापारतद्विपर्ययरूपत्वेन कर्मणां शमदमादीनां च परस्परविरोधः, भिन्नविषयत्वात्, विहितेषु करणव्यापारोऽविहितेषु प्रयोजनशून्येषु च तदुपशमः, इति। न च करणव्यापाररूपकर्मसु वर्तमानस्य वासनावशाच्छमदमादीनामुपादेयत्वासंभवः, विहितानां कर्मणां परमपुरुषाराधनतया तत्प्रसादद्वारेण निखिलविपरीतवासनोच्छेदहेतुत्वात्। अतो गृहस्थस्य शमदमाद्योऽप्यनुष्ठेयाः ॥ २७ ॥

शमदमाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (६)

सर्वान्नानुमतिश्च प्राणात्यये तद्दर्शनात् ॥ २८ ॥

(अधिकरण ७, सूत्राणि २८–३१)

[490] वाजिनां छन्दोगानां च प्राणविद्यायाम्

'न ह वा अस्यानन्नं जग्धं भवति नानन्नं परिगृहीतं भवति' (बृ. ६।१।१४)

---

restraint etc. Whence? Tadaṅgatayā tadvidheḥ—On account of the injunction in respect of them being subsidiary to Vidyā, as in

'Therefore, one knowing this, being tranquil, restrained, non-active, enduring, composed, should see the Ātman in the Ātman himself' (Br. 4·4·23)

—Because for the rise of Vidyā, Sama, Dama etc., being seen to be actively helping, being of the nature of the composure of the mind, and because Śama, Dama etc., are necessarily to be gone through for the securing of the Vidyā, they also have got to be gone through. Not again is there the mutual opposition of Karmans and Śama, Dama etc., on account of their having the nature of operation of the sense-organs, and the contrary of that (respectively), because they have different objects (to work upon). There is the operation of the sense-organs in (the matters) prescribed and its sublation in the case of non-prescribed (Karmans) void of any purpose. Not again in the case of a person associated with rites of the nature of operation of the sense-organs, is there the impossibility of his taking to Śama, Dama etc., through tha power of Vāsanā, on account of the prescribed Karmans being the cause of the rooting out of the entire opposite Vāsanās, through His grace, by propitiating the highest Purusa. Therefore, Śama, Dama etc., also are to be gone through by a house-holder ‖ 27 ‖

Here ends the Samadamādhikarana (6)

And permission for all food, only in danger to life, on account of that being seen ‖ 28 ‖

(Adhikaraṇa 7, Sūtras 28–31)

[490] In the Prāṇavidyā (-sections) of the Vājins, as well as of the Chandogas in

'(It is) not indeed, verily, that any non-food is eaten by them; nor, any non-food is accepted'– (Br. 6·1·14)

'न ह वा एवंविदि किञ्चनानन्नं भवति' (छा. ५।२।१)

इति प्राणविदः सर्वान्नानुमतिः संकीर्त्यते। किमियं सर्वान्नानुमतिः प्राणविद्यानिष्ठस्य सर्वदा, उत प्राणात्ययापत्तौ? इति विशये, विशेषानुपादानात्सर्वदेति प्राप्ते, उच्यते—प्राणात्यये, इति। चशब्दोऽवधारणे। प्राणात्ययापत्तावेवेत्यर्थः। कुतः? तद्दर्शनात्—दृश्यते ह्यन्यत्र ब्रह्मविदामपि प्राणात्ययापत्तावेव सर्वान्नाभ्यनुज्ञा, किं पुनः प्राणविदः? उषस्तः किल चाक्रायणो ब्रह्मविदग्रेसरो मटचीहतेषु कुरुषु दुर्भिक्षदूषितेष्विभ्यग्रामे वसन्ननशनेन प्राणसंशयमापन्नो ब्रह्मविद्यानिष्पत्तये प्राणानामनवसादमाकाङ्क्षमाणः, इभ्यं, कुल्माषान्खादन्तं भिक्षमाणस्तेन चोच्छिष्टेभ्योऽन्ये न विद्यन्त इति प्रत्युक्तः, पुनरप्येतेषां मे देहीत्युक्त्वा तेन चेभ्येनोच्छिष्टेभ्य आदाय दत्तान्कुल्माषान्परिगृह्यानुपानप्रतिग्रहमिभ्येनार्थितः

'उच्छिष्टं मे पीतं स्यात्' (छा. १।१०।३)

इति वदंश्चाक्रायणः, किमेते कुल्माषा अनुच्छिष्टा इतीभ्येन पर्यनुयुक्तः

'न वा अजीविष्यमिमानखादन्कामो म उदपानम्' (छा १।१०।४)

'*Not indeed, verily, in the case of one knowing thus can anything be non-food*' (Chā. 5·2·1)

is declared in the case of a Prāṇa-knower permission for eating all food. The doubt being there — Is this permission for eating all food for all time for one who is devoted to the Prāṇavidyā, or in the exigency of danger to life? — (The prima facie view) being reached — on account of the absence of any specific mention, always, — it is stated (in reply) Prāṇātyaye — The word Ca is for the sake of emphasis — that is to say, only in the exigency of danger to life. Whence? Taddarśanāt — for, it is seen elsewhere, that even in the case of the Brahman-knowers, there is the permission for all food only in the exigency of danger to life; what again in the case of the Prāṇa-knower? Uṣasta, the son of Cakrāyaṇa, it is reported, the foremost of the Brahman-knowers, while the Kuru regions were affected by hail and were suffering from famine, residing in the Ibhya village, being in danger to life on account of starvation, desiring that his life should not come to an end, for the sake of the accomplishment of the Brahmavidyā, begging of (the villager) Ibhya who was eating the Kulmāṣas, when replied to by him — Other than these half-eaten by me, there are none; having said to him once again — Give me (some) of these; having accepted the Kulmāṣas given by that Ibhya taken out of what had been left over, requested by Ibhya that he should accept the water after (the food is eaten,) — Cākrāyaṇa saying —

'*(In that case) my drinking would be something used by another (and hence unclean)*' (Chā. 1·10·3)

and being confronted with the rejoinder by Ibhya—Are these Kulmāṣas not used by another?—having said

'*I would not have lived, not eating these; the drinking of water would be at my will*'— (Chā. 1·10·4)

इति कुल्माषखादने स्वस्य प्राणसंशयापत्तेस्तावन्मात्रखादनेन धृतप्राणस्य स्वस्योच्छिष्टोदकपानं कामकारितं निषिद्धं स्यादित्युक्त्वा, स्वखादितशेषं जायायै दत्त्वा, तया च रक्षितानपरेद्युर्याजनेनार्जिजीषया जिगमिषुः पुनरपि प्राणसंशयमापन्नस्तानिभ्येभ्योच्छिष्टान्स्वोच्छिष्टभूतान्पर्युषितांश्चखाद। अतो ब्रह्मविदामपि प्राणसंशय एव सर्वान्नानुमतिदर्शनादत्राविशेषेण कीर्तितमपि प्राणविदः सर्वान्नीनत्वं प्राणात्ययापत्तावेवेति निश्चीयते ॥ २८ ॥

अबाधाच्च ॥ २९ ॥

'आहारशुद्धौ सत्त्वशुद्धिः सत्त्वशुद्धौ ध्रुवा स्मृतिः' (छा. ७।२६।२)

इति ब्रह्मविद्योत्पत्तावाहारशुद्धिविधानाबाधादपि ब्रह्मविदां सर्वान्नीनत्वमापद्विषयमवगम्यते। एवं ब्रह्मविदामतिशयितशक्तीनामपि सर्वान्नीनत्वस्यापद्विषयत्वात्प्राणविदोऽल्पशक्तेः सर्वान्नानुमतिरापद्विषयैव ॥ २९ ॥

अपि स्मर्यते ॥ ३० ॥

अपि चापद्विषयमेव सर्वान्नीनत्वं ब्रह्मविदामन्येषां च स्मर्यते—

---

about his exigency viz. danger to life if the Kulmāṣas were not eaten, and his being able to keep on his life by the eating of that much, the drinking of the water (unclean) used up by another, in his case being voluntary, would be prohibited; having given to his wife something remaining after he had eaten, and desirous of going with a view to earn by performing a sacrifice (for some one) the next day, once again afraid of danger to life, ate those same (Kulmāsas) used up by Ibhya, used up by himself and left over, and those preserved by her (his wife). Therefore, available even in the case of the Brahman knowers, permission for eating all food being only when there is the danger to life, the eating of all food by the Prāna-knower, described here without any qualification, is ascertained to be (valid) only in the exigency of danger to life. ‖ 28 ‖

And on account of non-contradiction ‖ 29 ‖

Also on account of the non-contradiction of the injunction about pure food for the production of Brahmavidyā, in

'When there is pure (clean) food, there is the purity of Sattva; when there is the purity of Sattva, there is permanent remembrance' (Chā. 7·26·2)

it is known that the eating of all food in the case of the Brahman-knowers refers to (times of) calamity. Thus, on account of being the eater of all food in the case of Brahman-knowers although possessed of excessive powers, referring only to (times of) calamity, permission for all food in the case of the Prāṇa-knower possessed of scanty power, refers only to (times of) calamity. ‖ 29 ‖

Moreover, it is mentioned in the Smṛti ‖ 30 ‖

Moreover, being the eater of all food in the case of Brahman-knowers and others is mentioned in the Smrti, as referring only to calamity—

'प्राणसंशयमापन्नो योऽन्नमत्ति यतस्ततः ।
लिप्यते न स पापेन पद्मपत्रमिवाम्भसा ॥'

इति ॥ ३० ॥

शब्दश्चातोऽकामकारे ॥ ३१ ॥

यतो ब्रह्मविदामन्येषां च सर्वान्नीनत्वमापद्विषयमेवात एव सर्वेषामकामकारे शब्दः, कामकारस्य प्रतिषेधकः शब्दो वर्तते। अस्ति हि कठानां संहितायां कामकारस्य प्रतिषेधकः शब्दः —

'तस्माद्ब्राह्मण सुरां न पिबति पाप्मना नोत्सृजा इति' (कठ. सं.)

इति। पाप्मना संसृष्टो न भवानीति मत्वा ब्राह्मणः सुरां न पिबतीत्यर्थः ॥ ३१ ॥

सर्वान्नानुमत्यधिकरणं समाप्तम् (७)

विहितत्वाच्चाश्रमकर्मापि ॥ ३२ ॥

(अधिकरण ८, सूत्राणि ३२–३५)

[491] यज्ञादिकर्माङ्गिका ब्रह्मविद्येत्युक्तम्। तानि च यज्ञादीनि कर्माण्यमुमुक्षुणा केवलाश्रमिणाप्यनुष्ठेयानि, उत नेति चिन्तायां, विद्याङ्गानां सतां केवलाश्रमशेषत्वे नित्यानित्यसंयोगविरोधः प्रसज्यते, इति यज्ञादीनां केवलाश्रमधर्मत्वं न संभवतीति प्राप्ते, उच्यते —

'Who eats food from any place whatsoever, being in the danger of losing his life, he is not contaminated by sin, like a lotus-leaf by the water.'

॥ 30 ॥

(The Śruti) word, for this very reason, referring to activity not at will. ॥ 31 ॥

Because being the eater of all food in the case of the Brahman-knowers and others, refers only to (the times of) calamity; for this very reason, in the case of all, Akāmakāre Śabdah—word prohibiting actions at will, exists. For, in the Saṁhitā of the Kathas, there is the word prohibiting activity at will—

'Therefore, a Brāhmaṇa does not drink wine, thinking—I may not be freed from sin' (Katha. Sam.)

—that is to say, a Brāhmaṇa does not drink wine, thinking that he may not be associated with sin. ॥ 31 ॥

Here ends the Sarvānnānumatyadhikaraṇa (7)

And on account of being prescribed, the Āśrama-Karmans also ॥ 32 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 8, Sūtras 32–35)

[491] It has been stated that Brahmavidyā has sacrifice and other rites subsidiary to it. In considering whether those rites, sacrifice and others, are to be gone through also by one sticking only to the Āśrama (duties), not desirous of salvation or not ; — Yajña and others cannot be the duties only of the Āśramas, because thereby there would be the undesirable contingency viz. conflict in respect of being connected with the obligatory and occasional (Karmans) if being subsidiary to Vidyā they are only subsidiary to the Āśramas —This (prime facie view) being reached, it is stated—Āśrama-karmāpi

आश्रमकर्मापि, इति। आश्रमस्य कर्मापि भवति, केवलाश्रमिणाप्यनुष्ठेयानीत्यर्थः। कुतः ?

'*यावज्जीवमग्निहोत्रं जुहोति*' (आ. श्रौ. ३।१४।११)

इत्यादिना, विहितत्वात्—जीवननिमित्ततया नित्यवद्विहितत्वादित्यर्थः ॥ ३२ ॥

तथा विद्याङ्गतया च

'*तमेतं वेदानुवचनेन*' (बृ. ४।४।२२)

इत्यादिना विहितत्वाद्विद्याशेषतयाप्यनुष्ठेयानीत्याह—

सहकारित्वेन च ॥ ३३ ॥

विद्योत्पत्तिद्वारेण विद्यासहकारितयाप्यनुष्ठेयानि। अग्निहोत्रादीनामिव जीवनाधिकारस्वर्गादिवद्विनियोगपृथक्त्वेनोभयार्थत्वं न विरुध्यते, इत्यर्थः ॥ ३३ ॥

तद्वदेव कर्मान्तरत्वमपि नास्तीत्याह—

सर्वथापि त एवोभयलिङ्गात् ॥ ३४ ॥

सर्वथा विद्यार्थत्वे आश्रमार्थत्वेऽपि त एव यज्ञादय इति प्रतिपत्तव्यं, न कर्मस्वरूपभेदः, इत्यर्थः। कुतः ? उभयलिङ्गात्—उभयत्र श्रुतौ यज्ञादिशब्दैः प्रत्यभिज्ञाप्यविनियोगात्कर्म-

---

—there are the (religious) acts also connected with the Āśrama; that is to say, they are to be gone through even by those who stick only to the Āśramas. Whence? On account of their being enjoined in

'*One performs the Agnihotra as long as one lives*' (Ā. Śrau. 3·14·11)

etc.,—that is to say, they are prescribed as obligatory owing to their being dependent upon (the person) being alive. ॥ 32 ॥

And similarly, because they are prescribed as subsidiary to Vidyā, in

'*Him, this one, in accordance with the statement in the Vedas*' (Bṛ. 4·4·22)

etc., they are to be gone through, even as being subsidiary to Vidyā—so, says (the Sūtrakāra)

And on account of their nature as co-workers ॥ **33** ॥

They are to be gone through because they are even the co-workers of Vidyā, through the production of Vidyā. That is to say, their being for the sake of both, owing to the application being different, is not contradicted like the qualified life-status and heaven etc., as in the case of Agnihotra etc. ॥ 33 ॥

And likewise also, there is not other Karman as well—so says (the Sūtrakāra)—

In any case, they the same, on account of the indicatory mark in both ॥ **34** ॥

In all cases, whether they are for the sake of Vidyā or even for the sake of the Āśramas, they are the same, sacrifice and others—this should be borne in mind. That is to say, there is no difference in the nature of the Karman. Whence? Ubhayaliṅgāt—on account of the Śruti passsages in

स्वरूपभेदे प्रमाणाभावाच्च ॥ ३४ ॥

अनभिभवं च दर्शयति ॥ ३५ ॥

'धर्मेण पापमपनुदति'　　(म. ना. २२।१)

इत्यादिभिश्च तानेव यज्ञादिधर्मान्निर्दिश्य तैर्विद्याया अनभिभवं पापकर्मभिरुत्पत्तिप्रतिबन्धाभावं दर्शयति। अहरहरनुष्ठीयमानैर्हि यज्ञादिभिर्विशुद्धेऽन्तःकरणे प्रत्यहं प्रकृष्यमाणा विद्योत्पद्यते। अतस्त एवोभयत्र यज्ञादयः ॥ ३५ ॥

विहितत्वाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (८)

अन्तरा चापि तु तद्दृष्टेः ॥ ३६ ॥

(अधिकरण ९, सूत्राणि ३६–३९)

[**492**] चतुर्णामाश्रमिणां ब्रह्मविद्यायामधिकारोऽस्ति, विद्यासहकारिण आश्रमधर्मा इति चोक्तम्। ये पुनराश्रमानन्तरा वर्तन्ते विधुरादयस्तेषां ब्रह्मविद्यायामधिकारोऽस्ति न वेति विशये, आश्रमधर्मेतिकर्तव्यताकत्वाद्विद्याया अनाश्रमिणां चाश्रमधर्माभावान्नास्त्यधिकारः, इति प्राप्ते, उच्यते — अन्तरा चापि तु, इति। तुशब्दः पक्षव्यावृत्त्यर्थः। चशब्दोऽवधारणे। अन्तरा वर्तमानानामनाश्रमिणामपि विद्यायामधिकारोऽस्त्येव। कुतः ? तद्दृष्टेः — दृश्यते हि

---

both cases, there being the practical application which can be recognised by the word Yajña etc., and on account of the absence of any means of proof as regards the difference in the nature of the Karman ॥ 34 ॥

And the Śruti shows non-overpowering ॥ 35 ॥

And having referred to the same religious duties, the sacrifice etc, by

'He drives away sin by Dharma'　　(M. Nā. 22·1)

etc, (the Sruti) points to the Anabhibhava of Vidyā by them — (that is to say) the absence of any obstacle to the production, by sinful deeds. For, Vidyā is produced being augmented (dragged nearer) every day in the mind (rendered) very pure by sacrifice etc., performed day after day. Therefore, the sacrifice and others are the same in both. ॥ 35 ॥

Here ends the Vihitatvādhikarana (8)

And (there is) even (in the case of the non-Āsramites, staying) midway, however, (qualification for Vidyā) on account of that being seen ॥ 36 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 9, Sūtras 36–39)

[**492**] It has been stated that the followers of the four Āśramas are qualified for the study of Brahmavidyā, and the Āśrama-duties are the co-workers of Vidyā. Those again that are in between the Āśramas like widowers and others, — Are they qualified for Brahmavidyā or not ? — This doubt being there, (the prima facie view) being reached, that they have no qualification on account of the Vidyā being associated with the know-how (ultimate purpose) of the Āśrama-duties and there is the absence of the Āśrama-duties in the case of the non-*Āśramites* — it is stated (in reply) — Antarā cāpi tu — the word Tu is for the purpose of turning away the (above) view; the word Ca (is) for the sake of emphasis. There is surely even in the case of the non-Āśramites standing midway, the qualification (eligibility) for Vidyā.

रैक्वभीष्मसंवर्तादीनामनाश्रमिणामपि ब्रह्मविद्यानिष्ठत्वम् । न चाश्रमधर्मैरेव विद्यानुग्रहः, इति शक्यं वक्तुम्,

'यज्ञेन दानेन तपसानाशकेन' (बृ. ४।४।२२)

इति दानादीनामाश्रमेष्वनैकान्तिकानामप्यनुग्राहकत्वश्रवणात् । यथोर्ध्वरेतःसु विद्यानिष्ठत्वदर्शनादग्निहोत्रादिव्यतिरिक्तैरेव विद्यानुग्रहः क्रियते, तथानाश्रमिष्वपि विद्यादर्शनादाश्रमानियतैर्जपोपवासदानदेवताराधनादिभिर्विद्यानुग्रहः शक्यते कर्तुम् ॥ ३६ ॥

अपि स्मर्यते ॥ ३७ ॥

अपि चानाश्रमिणामपि जपादिभिरेव विद्यानुग्रहः स्मर्यते

'जप्येनापि च संसिध्येद्ब्राह्मणो नात्र संशयः ।
कुर्यादन्यन्न वा कुर्यान्मैत्रो ब्राह्मण उच्यते ॥' (मनु. २।८७)

इति । संसिध्येत् — जपाद्यनुगृहीतया विद्यया सिद्धो भवतीत्यर्थः ॥ ३७ ॥

विशेषानुग्रहश्च ॥ ३८ ॥

न केवलं न्यायस्मृतिभ्यामयमर्थः साधनीयः । श्रूयते चानाश्रमनियतैर्धर्मविशेषैर्विद्यानुग्रहः

Whence? Taddrsteh — There is indeed seen even in the case of the non-Āśramites, Raikva, Bhīṣma, Saṁvarta and others, extreme attachment to Brahmavidyā. Nor again is it possible to say that there is the favour of Vidyā only by the Āśrama-duties; because gifts etc., in

'By the sacrifice, gifts, by penance, indestructible' (Br. 4·4·22)'

although not invariably found in the Āśramas are mentioned as being favourable (to Vidyā). Just as in the case of the celibates, devotion to Vidyā is seen and the favour of Vidyā is accomplished by things different from Agnihotra etc, similarly in the case of the non-followers of Āśramas also, Vidyā is seen, and the favour of Vidyā is possible to be had by the muttering of prayers, fasting, gifts, worship of deities etc, which are not confined as a rule to the Āśramas. ॥ 36 ॥

And it is mentioned in Smṛti ॥ 37 ॥

And moreover, even in the case of the non-followers of the Āśramas, the favour of Vidyā is mentioned in the Smṛti as being due only to the muttering of prayers etc, as in

'A Brāhmaṇa may reach perfection even by the (silent) muttering of prayers; no doubt about it. He may or may not perform anything else, a Brāhmaṇa is friendly to all'. (Manu. 2·87)

Samsidhyet — attains to perfection by the Vidyā favoured by Japa etc., —this (is) the sense ॥ 37 ॥

And there (is) the special favour ॥ 38 ॥

Not is this matter to be solved by mere reasoning and Smṛti works. It is mentioned in the Śruti that there is the favour of Vidyā by specific religious duties not confined to the Āśramas, in

'तपसा ब्रह्मचर्येण श्रद्धया विद्ययात्मानमन्विष्येत्' (प्र. १।१०)

इति ॥ ३८ ॥

अतस्त्वितरज्ज्यायो लिङ्गाच्च ॥ ३९ ॥

तुशब्दोऽवधारणे । अतोऽनाश्रमित्वादितरदाश्रमित्वमेव ज्यायः । अनाश्रमित्वमापद्विषयम् । शक्तस्य त्वाश्रमित्वमेवोपादेयमित्यर्थः, भूयोधर्मकाल्पधर्मकयोरतुल्यकार्यत्वात् । लिङ्गाच्च — स्मृतेरित्यर्थः । स्मर्यते च शक्तं प्रत्याश्रमस्योपादेयत्वम्

'अनाश्रमी न तिष्ठेत्तु दिनमेकमपि द्विजः ।' (दक्ष. १।१०)

इत्यादिना । निवृत्तब्रह्मचर्यस्याकृतदारस्य मृतभार्यस्य चावैराग्ये सति दारालाभ आपत् ॥ ३९ ॥

विधुराधिकरणं समाप्तम् (९)

तद्भूतस्य तु नातद्भावो जैमिनेरपि नियमात्तद्रूपाभावेभ्यः ॥ ४० ॥

(अधिकरण १०, सूत्राणि ४०–४३)

[493] नैष्ठिकवैखानसपरिव्राजकाश्रमेभ्यः प्रच्युतानामपि ब्रह्मविद्यायामधि-

---

'By penance, celibacy, faith and Vidyā, one should search for the Ātman' (Pra. 1·10)

॥ 38 ॥

But for this reason, the other one is superior, and on account of the Linga (Smṛti) ॥ 39 ॥

The word Tu is for the sake of emphasis. For this very reason, the one other than a non-follower of Āśrama — viz. being a follower of Āsrama is alone superior. Not being a follower of Āśrama is a case of exigency— (Āpat), that is to say, one who is capable must take to being the follower of (some) Āśrama (or other), on account of the two viz one having abundant Dharma, and another having a scanty Dharma — both cannot be functioning equally. Liṅgācca — that is to say, on the strength of the Smrti — The Smṛti mentions the resorting to the Āśrama in respect of one who is qualified, in

'A twice-born should nat stay even for a single day, as not belonging to any Āśrama' (Dakṣa 1·10)

etc. In the case of one who is past the Brahmacaryāśrama, one who has not taken a wife, and one whose wife is dead, — not having a wife, there being no freedom from attachment, is a calamity. ॥ 39 ॥

Here ends the Vidhurādhikaraṇa (9)

But in the case of one belonging to that (Āśrama) there cannot be absence from that, even according to Jaimini, owing to the restriction in respect of the absence of their characteristics. ॥ 40 ॥

(Adhikarana 10, Sūtras 40–43)

[493] In considering whether there is the (required) qualification for (the study of) Brahmavidyā even in the case of those fallen away from the Āśramas — all-life Brahmacārins, foresters and Saṁnyāsins, — (the

कारोऽस्ति, न वेति चिन्तायां, विधुरादिवदनाश्रमैकान्तैर्दानादिभिर्विद्यानुग्रहसंभवादस्त्यधिकारः, इति प्राप्ते, उच्यते — तद्भूतस्य तु नातद्भाव', इति। तुशब्दः पक्षव्यावृत्त्यर्थः। तद्भूतस्य नैष्ठिकाद्याश्रमनिष्ठस्य नातद्भाव', अतथाभावोऽनाश्रमित्वेनावस्थानं न संभवति। कुतः ? तद्रूपाभावेभ्यो नियमात् — तद्रूपाणि तेषां नैष्ठिकादीनां रूपाणि तेषां धर्माः, इत्यर्थः। तेषामभावास्तद्रूपाभावा, तेभ्यः शास्त्रैर्नियमात्। नैष्ठिकाद्याश्रमं प्रविष्टान्स्वाश्रमधर्मनिवृत्तिभ्यो नियच्छन्ति हि शास्त्राणि।

' ब्रह्मचर्याचार्यकुलवासी तृतीयोऽत्यन्तमात्मानमाचार्यकुलेऽवसादयन् '
(छा २।२३।१)

इति।

' अरण्यमियात्ततो न पुनरेयात् '

इति च।

' संन्यस्याग्निं न पुनरावर्तयेत् ' (कठरु ४, कठश्रु २२)

इति च। अतो विधुरादिवन्नैष्ठिकादीनामनाश्रमित्वेनावस्थानासंभवान्न तानधिकरोति ब्रह्मविद्या जैमिनेरपि, इत्यविगानं दर्शयन्नुक्तं स्वाभिमतं द्रढयति ॥ ४० ॥

---

prima facie view) being reached that as in the case of widowers etc , there is the necessary qualification owing to the possibility of Vidyā favouring them, by gifts etc , that are not confined to any Āśrama, — it is said (in reply) — Tadbhūtasya tu nātadbhāvah — The word Tu is for the sake of turning away the (above) view Tadhbūtasya — of one belonging to the Āśramas, the all-life celibate etc ,— Nātadbhāvah — not remaining like that, no possibility of staying without belonging to some Āśrama Whence ? Tadrūpābhāvebhyo niyamāt — tadrūpāni — the features of those Naisthika etc , that is to say, their characteristics Tesāmabhāvah — absence of those characteristics, on account of their b ing restricted by the Sāstra to them, for, the Sāstras restrict those who have entered the Asramas, Naisthika etc , in respect of turning away from the duties of their Āśramas,

' The Brahmacārin, one residing in the preceptor's house, the third, not sparing himself thoroughly at the preceptor's house '
(Chā 2 23 1)

And also —

' He should go to the forest and should not come back from there '

And also —

' Having renounced, he should not take to the fire again '
(Katharu 4, Kathaśru 22)

Therefore, it being not possible for the Naisthika and others to remain like the widowers etc , without belonging to any Āśrama, Brahmavidyā does not confer upon them any qualification , showing by the expression Jaiminerapi, his agreement (with him, the Sūtrakāra) corroborates the view favoured by him, as stated ॥ 40 ॥

अथ स्यात् — नैष्ठिकादीनां ब्रह्मचर्यात्प्रच्युतानां प्रायश्चित्तादधिकारः संभवति। अस्ति च प्रायश्चित्तमधिकारलक्षणे निरूपितम्

'अवकीर्णिपशुश्च तद्वत्' (जै सू ६।८।२४)

इति। अत· प्रच्युतब्रह्मचर्यस्य प्रायश्चित्तसंभवात्कृतप्रायश्चित्तो ब्रह्मविद्यायामधिकरिष्यतीति— तत्राह—

न चाधिकारिकमपि पतनानुमानात्तदयोगात् ॥ ४१ ॥

[494] अधिकारलक्षणोक्तमपि प्रायश्चित्तं नैष्ठिकादीनां ततो भ्रष्टानां न संभवति। कुत· ? पतनानुमानात्तदयोगात् – नैष्ठिकादीनां प्रच्युतानां पतनस्मृतेस्तस्य प्रायश्चित्तस्यासंभवात्।

'आरूढो नैष्ठिक धर्मं यस्तु प्रच्यवते द्विज ।
प्रायश्चित्त न पश्यामि येन शुध्येत्स आत्महा ॥' (अत्रिस्मृ ८।१६)

इति। अतोऽधिकारलक्षणोक्तं प्रायश्चित्तमितरब्रह्मचारिविषयम् ॥ ४१ ॥

उपपूर्वमपीत्येके भावमशनवत्तदुक्तम् ॥ ४२ ॥

नैष्ठिकादीनां ब्रह्मचर्यप्रच्यवनमुपपूर्वमुपपातकं महापातकेष्वपरिगणितत्वादिति तत्र

Now it may be (argued) that the necessary qualification is possible in the case of the Naisthikas who have fallen away from celibacy, on account of the atonement, and there is mentioned the atonement in *Adhikāralakṣana*, in

'One who has scattered his semen over a beast, like that' (Jai Sū 6 8 24)

Therefore, atonement being possible in the case of one fallen from celibacy, after making the atonement one would have the necessary qualification for Brahmavidyā —There (the Sūtrakāra) says —

And not (the atonement) even in the Adhikāra-section, on account of the Smṛti passage referring to the fall, and on account of the impossibility of that ॥ 41 ॥

[494] The atonement although mentioned in the *Adhikāralakṣana* is not possible in the case of Naisthikas and others who have fallen from them (their respective Āsramas) Whence ? Patanānumanāttadayogāt — On account of the Smṛti passage referring to the fall of those who have fallen away, Naisthikas and others, that atonement is not possible—

'Having taken to the duties of an all-life celibate, that twice--born who falls away (from them) — I do not see any atonement (for him), by which that Ātman killer would be purified'. (Atrismṛ 8 16)

Therefore, the atonement mentioned in the Adhikāra-chapter refers to other Brahmacārins (and not to the Naisthika) ॥ 41 ॥

Because it is just a minor sin, some (admit) the existence (of atonement) like eating, that has been said ॥ 42 ॥

Falling away from celibacy in the case of the Naiṣṭhika Brahmacārin and others — Upapūrvam — a minor sin, on account of its being not counted among the great sins So some preceptors admit the Bhāva — existence also

प्रायश्चित्तस्य भावं विद्यमानतामप्येक आचार्या मन्यन्ते । अशनवत् — यथा मध्वशनादिनिषेधस्तत्प्रायश्चित्तं चोपकुर्वाणस्य नैष्ठिकादीनां च समानम् । तदुक्तं स्मृतिकारैः

'उत्तरेषां चैतदविरोधि' (गौतम १।३।४)

इति । गुरुकुलवासिनो यदुक्तम्, तत्स्वाश्रमाविरोध्युत्तरेषामप्याश्रमिणां भवतीत्यर्थः । तद्वदिहापीति ब्रह्मचर्यप्रच्यवने प्रायश्चित्तसंभवाद्ब्रह्मविद्यायोग्यताप्यस्ति ॥ ४२ ॥

बहिस्तूभयथापि स्मृतेराचाराच्च ॥ ४३ ॥

तुशब्दो मतान्तरव्यावृत्त्यर्थः । उपपातकत्वे महापातकत्वेऽप्येते बहिर्भूता एव ब्रह्मविद्याधिकारिभ्यः । ब्रह्मविद्यायामनधिकृता इत्यर्थः । कुतः ? स्मृतेः — पूर्वोक्तात्पतनस्मरणात् । यद्यपि कलुषनिर्हरणाय कैश्चिद्वचनैः प्रायश्चित्ताधिकारो विद्यते, तथापि कर्माधिकारानुगुणशुद्धिहेतुप्रायश्चित्तं न संभवति

'प्रायश्चित्तं न पश्यामि येन शुध्येत्स आत्महा ।' (अत्रिस्मृ. ८।१६)

इति स्मृतेरित्यर्थः । आचाराच्च—शिष्टा हि नैष्ठिकादीन्भ्रष्टान्कृतप्रायश्चित्तानपि वर्जयन्ति । तेभ्यो ब्रह्मविद्यादिकं नोपदिशन्ति । अतस्तेषां नास्ति ब्रह्मविद्यायामधिकारः ॥ ४३ ॥

तद्भूताधिकरणं समाप्तम् (१०)

---

of the atonement there. Aśanavat — Like eating. As there is the prohibition of the eating of honey etc, and its atonement, the same would be the position in respect of the Brahmacārin fallen from celibacy and the Naisṭhika etc. That has been said by the Smṛtikāras —

'And this is not conflicting with the latter' (Gautama 1·3·4)

That is to say, — what has been said in connection with him who resides at the preceptor's house, that not in conflict with one's own Āśrama, exists in the case of the followers of the later Āśramas also. Like that, here also, there being the possibility of an atonement, when fallen away from celibacy, there is also the fitness for Brahmavidyā ॥ 42 ॥

But outside, even in both cases, on account of the Smṛti and on account of the (rule of) conduct. ॥ 43 ॥

The word Tu is for the purpose of turning away the other view. Whether it is a minor sin or a great sin, these are definitely outside the pale of those qualified for Brahmavidyā — that is to say, not qualified for the Brahmavidyā. Whence ? Smṛteḥ — on account of the Smṛti passage about fall, mentioned before. Although one is entitled to the atonement on account of some statements (in the Śāstras), for the sake of removing the sin, still there is not possible the atonement which is the cause of purity befitting the qualification for (performing some sacrificial) Karman on account of the Smṛti —

'I see no atonement by which that Ātman-killer could be purified' (Atrismṛ. 8·16)

— This (is) the sense. Ācārācca — And on account of the rule of conduct; for, gentlemen avoid Naisṭhika etc., who had fallen away, although they have undergone atonement, they do not teach them Brahmavidyā etc. Therefore, they are not entitled to Brahmavidyā. ॥ 43 ॥

Here ends the Tadbhūtādhikaraṇa (10)

स्वामिनः फलश्रुतेरित्यात्रेयः ॥ ४४ ॥

(अधिकरण ११, सू. ४४–४५)

[495] कर्माङ्गाश्रयाण्युद्गीथाद्युपासनानि किं यजमानकर्तृकाणि, उत, ऋत्विक्कर्तृकाणि, इति चिन्तायां, यजमानकर्तृकाणीत्यात्रेयो मन्यते—कुतः ? फलश्रुतेः । वेदान्तविहितेषु दहराद्युपासनेषु फलोपासनयोरेकाश्रयत्वदर्शनात्, इह च क्रतुफलाप्रतिबन्धरूपस्योद्गीथोपासनफलस्य यजमानाश्रयत्वश्रवणादित्यर्थः । न च गोदोहनादिवदङ्गाश्रयत्वेन यजमानकर्तृकत्वासंभवः । गोदोहनादिषु ह्यध्वर्युकर्तृकप्रणयनाश्रयगोदोहनोपादानमन्येनाशक्यम् । इह तूद्गातृकर्तृकेऽप्युद्गीथे तस्योद्गीथादे रसतमत्वानुसंधानं यजमानेनैव कर्तुं शक्यते ॥ ४४ ॥

इति प्राप्ते, अभिधीयते—

आर्त्विज्यमित्यौडुलोमिस्तस्मै हि परिक्रीयते ॥ ४५ ॥

आर्त्विज्यमृत्विजः कर्मोद्गीथाद्युपासनमित्यौडुलोमिराचार्यो मन्यते । कुतः । तस्मै हि प्रयोजनायर्त्विक्परिक्रीयते । फलसाधनभूतस्य साङ्गस्य क्रतोरुपादानायेत्यर्थः । कर्मविधिषु

' ऋत्विजो वृणीते ऋत्विग्भ्यो दक्षिणां ददाति ' (सत्या श्रौ सू. १०।१)

Of the Yajamāna, on account of the Śruti about the fruit — so (opines) Ātreya ॥ 44 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 11, Sūtras 44–45)

[495] While considering whether the Upāsanās, Udgītha and others resorting to a part of the sacrificial rite, have the sacrificer as the agent or the priests, Ātreya opines—they have the sacrificer as their agent. Whence ? Phalaśruteḥ — on account of the fruit and the Upāsanā being seen to have one resort in the Upāsanās, Dahara etc., prescribed in the Vedāntas, and here also on account of the fruit of the Udgīthopāsana, of the form of non-obstruction to the fruit of the sacrifice mentioned as having the sacrificer as the resort — This (is) the sense. Not again is there the impossibility of the sacrificer being the agent, on account of his being the resort of the subsidiary thing, like the *godohana* vessel etc. It is not possible for any one else to take the *godohana* which is associated with the approach with the Adhvaryu as the agent. But here though the Udgītha has the Udgātṛ as the agent, it is possible for the sacrificer himself to contemplate upon the Udgītha etc., as having the preeminent Rasa. ॥ 44 ॥

This (prima facie view) being reached, it is stated (in reply)—

The priestly act, — so Auḍulomi ; for that he is indeed bought ॥ 45 ॥

Ārtvijyam — the duty of a priest, the Upāsana (worship) of the Udgītha etc. — thus the preceptor Auḍulomi opines. Whence ? Tasmai hi — for that purpose the priest is bought — that is to say, for the performance of the sacrifice with the parts, which is the means of the fruit. From the Śāstra mentioning the priest as the agent in respect of the injunctions about the rite—

' He chooses the priests, he gives Dakṣiṇā to the priests '

(Satyā-Śrau. Sū. 10·1)

इत्यृत्विक्कर्तृकत्वशास्त्रेण फलसाधनभूतं साङ्गं कर्मर्त्विग्भिरनुष्ठेयमित्यवगम्यते। तदन्तर्गतानि कायिकानि मानसानि च कर्माण्यृत्विक्कर्तृकाण्येव। न च शक्त्यशक्ती तस्य निबन्धनम्। यद्यप्युद्गीथाद्युपासनं पुरुषार्थस्तथापि क्रत्वधिकृताधिकारत्वात्क्रतोश्च साङ्गस्यर्त्विक्कर्तृकत्वात्,

'यदेव विद्यया करोति तदेव वीर्यवत्तरम्' (छा. १।१।१०)

इत्यृत्विक्कर्तृकक्रियोपयोगित्वेन विद्यायास्तदेककर्तृकत्वश्रवणादृत्विक्कर्तृकाण्येतानि। दहरादिषूपासनेष्वृत्विक्कर्तृकत्वाश्रवणात्

'शास्त्रफलं प्रयोक्तरि' (जै. सू. ३।७।१८)

इति न्यायाच्च फलिकर्तृकत्वमेव ॥ ४५ ॥

स्वाम्यधिकरणं समाप्तम् (११)

सहकार्यन्तरविधिः पक्षेण तृतीयं तद्वतो विध्यादिवत् ॥ ४६ ॥

(अधिकरण १२, सूत्राणि ४६–४८)

[496]

'तस्माद्ब्राह्मणः पाण्डित्यं निर्विद्य बाल्येन तिष्ठासेत्। बाल्यं च पाण्डित्यं च निर्विद्याथ मुनिः' (बृ. ३।५।१)

---

it is known that the (entire) rite with the parts, the means of the fruit, is to be performed by the priests. The acts, physical and mental, within that have the priest himself as the agent. Nor again, being strong or weak is the restraining factor of that. Although the Upāsana of Udgītha etc., is (conducive to) salvation, still, because it forms a qualification for one entitled to perform a sacrifice, and because the entire sacrifice with its parts has the priest as the agent and because the Vidyā is mentioned in the Śruti as having the same (priest) alone as the agent, because it is useful for the rite the performer of which is the priest — in

'Whatever he does by Vidyā, that alone becomes more powerful' (Chā. 1·1·10)

— these have the priest for their performer. In the case of the worships Dahara etc., the priest as the performer not being mentioned, there is definitely the state of the agent for one who aspires for the fruit, in accordance with the maxim—

'The fruit of the Śāstra belongs to the performer.' (Jai. Sū. 3·7·18)

॥ 45 ॥

Here ends the Svāmyadhikaraṇa (11)

The injunction about the other co-workers, alternatively the third, the one possessed of that (Vidyā) like the injunction etc. ॥ 46 ॥

(Adhikarana 12, Sūtras 46–48)

[496] The doubt being there, whether in (the passage)

'Therefore, the Brāhmaṇa, getting disgusted with learning, should stay on like a child; and getting disgusted with learning and childlike nature, then (he should turn into) an ascetic' (Br. 3·5·1)

इत्यत्र बाल्यपाण्डित्यवन्मौनमपि विधीयते, उत, अनूद्यते, इति विशये, मौनपाण्डित्यशब्दयोर्ज्ञानार्थत्वात्, पाण्डित्यं निर्विद्य, इति विहितमेव ज्ञानमथ मुनिरित्यनूद्यते। विधिशब्दो न ह्यत्र श्रूयते, इति। एवं प्राप्ते, ब्रूमः — सहकार्यन्तरविधि, इति। तद्वतो विद्यावतः, विध्यादिवत् — विधीयत इति विधिः। यज्ञादिः सर्वाश्रमधर्मः शमदमादयश्च विधिशब्देनोच्यन्ते। आदिशब्देन श्रवणमनने गृह्येते। सहकार्यन्तरविधिरित्यत्रापि, विधीयते, इति विधिः। सहकार्यन्तरं विधिश्चेति सहकार्यन्तरविधिः।

एतदुक्तं भवति — यथा

'तमेतं वेदानुवचनेन ब्राह्मणा विविदिषन्ति यज्ञेन दानेन तपसानाशकेन' (बृ ४।४।२२)

इत्यादिना

'शान्तो दान्तः' (बृ ४।४।२३)

इत्यादिना च सहकारी यज्ञादिः शमदमादिश्च विधीयते, यथा च

'श्रोतव्यो मन्तव्यः' (बृ २।४।५)

इति श्रवणमनने चार्थप्राप्ते विद्यासहकारित्वेन गृह्येते, तथा

'तस्माद्ब्राह्मण पाण्डित्यं निर्विद्य' (बृ ३।५।१)

---

silence also is enjoined like the childlike nature, and learning (scholarship), or it is merely repeated—because the words Mauna and Pandītya mean knowledge, the knowledge which is already enjoined — Being disgusted with learning— is repeated in — Then Muni — and no injunctive word is indeed mentioned here in the Sruti — This (prima facie view) being reached, we say (in reply) — Sahakāryantaravidhih — Tadvatah — possessed of Vidyā, Viddhyādivat — Vidhi is that which is enjoined. By the word Vidhi are denoted sacrifice etc, the duties of all Āsramas, and tranquillity, restraint etc By the word Ādi are to be understood, hearing and meditating In (the expression) Sahakārayantarvidhi — here also Vidhi is that which is enjoined, another co-helper and Vidhi — the Sahakārayantaravidhi

This is what is intended to be said — Just as, in (the passage) beginning with

'Him, this one, the Brāhmanas desire to know in conformity with the teachings of the Veda, by sacrifice, by gift, by penance indestructible' (Br 4·4 22)

etc, and in (the passage)

'Tranquil, restrained' (Br 4·4 23)

etc., the co-workers, the sacrifice etc, and tranquillity, restraint etc, are enjoined, and just as in (the passage)

'He should be heard, thought of' (Br. 2 4·5)

learning and thinking implied by the sense are taken as co-workers of Vidyā in the same way, by (the passage)—

'Therefore, the Brāhmana, getting disgusted with learning' (Br. 3 5 1)

इत्यादिना पाण्डित्यं बाल्यं मौनमिति त्रितयं विद्यायाः सहकार्यन्तरं विधीयते, इति। मौनं च पाण्डित्यादर्थान्तरमित्याह, पक्षेण, इति। मुनिशब्दस्य पक्षेण प्रकृष्टमननशीले व्यासादौ प्रयोगदर्शनान्मौनं पाण्डित्यबाल्ययोर्द्वयोस्तृतीयम्। यद्यपि

'अथ मुनिः' (बृ. ३।५।१)

इत्यत्र विधिप्रत्ययो न श्रूयते तथापि मौनस्याप्राप्तत्वाद्विधेयत्वमङ्गीकरणीयम्, अथ मुनिः स्यात्, इति। इदं च मौनं श्रवणप्रतिष्ठार्थमननादर्थान्तरभूतमुपासनालम्बनस्य पुनः पुनःसंशीलनं तद्भावनारूपम्।

तदेवं वाक्यार्थः—ब्राह्मणो विद्यावान्पाण्डित्यं निर्विद्योपास्यं ब्रह्मतत्त्वं परिशुद्धं परिपूर्णं च विदित्वा, श्रवणमननाभ्यां प्राप्तं वेदनं प्रतिलभ्येत्यर्थः। तच्च भगवद्भक्तिकृतसत्त्वविवृद्धिकृतम्। यथोक्तम्

'नाहं वेदैः' (गीता ११।५३)

इत्यारभ्य

'भक्त्या त्वनन्यया शक्यो ज्ञातुम्' (गीता ११।५४)

इति। श्रुतिश्च

'यस्य देवे परा भक्तिः' (श्वे. ६।२३)

---

etc., the triad — Scholarship (learning), childlike nature, silence—the other co-workers of Vidyā — is enjoined. (The Sūtrakāra) says Pakṣeṇa — because silence is another thing from scholarship. As the word Muni as an alternative is seen as being used, referring to Vyāsa and others habituated to the highest thinking, silence is the third thing with the two — Scholarship and childlike nature. Although in (the expression)

'Then the ascetic' (Br. 3·5·1)

here the injunctive termination is not mentioned in the Sruti, still as silence is a new thing not arrived at before, its being associated with an injunction has got to be understood, in (the passage) — Then he would be Muni. And this silence is a thing different from meditating for the sake of establishing the hearing, again and again revolving upon the object of the Upāsanā, having the form of that mental state.

Thus then is the sense of the passage — A Brāhmaṇa possessed of Vidyā, getting disgusted with scholarship and having known Brahman, (the highest) reality, the object of worship, all-pure, all-full—having secured the knowledge got by hearing and meditation — this (is) the sense. And that is effected by the strengthening of the Sattva (quality), caused by devotion to the Lord. As has been said, beginning with—

'Not I, by the Vedās' (Gītā 11·53)

up to

'But by exclusive devotion, (I am) possible to be known' (Gītā 11·54)

And the Sruti—

'In whose case, there is the highest devotion to the Lord' (Śve. 6·23) –

'*नायमात्मा प्रवचनेन*'　　　　　　　　(का. २।२३; मु. ३।२।३)

इत्यादिका ।

'*बाल्येन तिष्ठासेत्*'　　　　　　　　(बृ. ३।५।१)

बाल्यस्वरूपं चानन्तरमेव वक्ष्यते ।

'*बाल्यं च पाण्डित्यं च निर्विद्याथ मुनिः स्यात्*'　　　　(बृ. ३।५।१)

बाल्यपाण्डित्ये यथावदुपादाय परिशुद्धे परिपूर्णे ब्रह्मणि मननशीलो भवेन्निदिध्यासनरूपविद्यावाप्तये । एवं त्रितयोपादानेन लब्धविद्यो भवतीत्याह

'*अमौनं मौनं च निर्विद्याथ ब्राह्मणः*'　　　　(बृ. ३।५।१)

इति। अमौनम् — मौनेतरसहकारिकलापः । तं च मौनं च यथावदुपाददानो विद्याकाष्ठां तदेकनिष्पाद्यां लभेतेत्यर्थः ।

'*स ब्राह्मणः केन स्यात्*'　　　　(बृ. ३।५।१)

इत्युक्तादुपायात्किमन्योऽप्युपायोऽस्ति ? इति पृष्टे

'*येन स्यात्तेनेदृश एव*'　　　　(बृ ३·५·१)

इति, येन मौनपर्यन्तेन ब्राह्मणः स्यादित्युक्तं तेनैवेदृशः स्यान्न केनाप्यन्येनोपायेनेति परिहृतम् । अतः सर्वेष्वाश्रमेषु स्थितस्य विदुषो यज्ञादिस्वाश्रमधर्मवत्पाण्डित्यादिकं मौनतृतीयं विद्यायाः सहकार्यन्तरं विधीयते ॥ ४६ ॥

'*Not, this Ātman, by lectures*'　　　　(Kā. 2·23; Mu. 3·2·3)

etc.

'*One should stay as a child*'　　　　(Br. 3·5·1)

— The nature of child-hood would be explained immediately below.

'*Getting disgusted with the childlike nature and scholarship, then he would be Muni (ascetic)*'　　　　(Br. 3·5 1)

— having taken to in a proper manner the childlike nature and scholarship, one should become habituated to reflecting upon the all-pure, all-full Brahman, for the sake of obtaining the Vidyā of the form of concentration. Thus by taking to the triad, he secures the Vidyā. This (the Śruti) says—

'*Being disgusted with non-silence and silence, then (he) becomes a Brāhmaṇa*'　　　　(Br. 3·5·1)

Amauna — the group of co-workers other than the Mauna. One taking to that and also to silence in the proper manner, would secure the highest Vidyā, to be produced by them alone — this (is) the sense. When asked — Is there any other means than the means mentioned in

'*How can he become a Brāhmaṇa?*'　　　　(Br. 3·5·1)

by the (answer)—

'*By whatever he is, by that itself, he is, verily, of this nature*'　　　　(Br. 3 5·1)

-- by which culminating into silence he is said to be a Brāhmana; by that itself he would be like this — not by any other means whatsoever, this has been repudiated. Therefore, in the case of the learned one, abiding in all the Aśramas, scholarship etc., with silence as the third is enjoined as the other co-workers of the Vidyā, like the duties, sacrifice etc., of his own Aśrama. || 46 ||

[497] अथ स्यात् — यदि सर्वेष्वाश्रमेषु स्थितानां विदुषां तत्तदाश्रमधर्मसहकारिणी मौनतृतीयसचिवा विद्या ब्रह्मप्राप्तिसाधनमुच्यते, कथं तर्हि छान्दोग्ये

' अभिसमावृत्य कुटुम्बे शुचौ देशे ' (छा. ८।१५।१)

इत्यारभ्य

' स खल्वेवं वर्तयन्यावदायुषं ब्रह्मलोकमभिसंपद्यते न च पुनरावर्तते ' (छा. ८।१५।१)

इति यावदायुषं गार्हस्थ्यधर्मेण स्थितिदर्शनमुपपद्यते ? इति । अत्राह—

कृत्स्नभावात्तु गृहिणोपसंहारः ॥ ४७ ॥

तुशब्दश्चोद्यं व्यावर्तयति । कृत्स्नभावात् — कृत्स्नेषु भावात्कृत्स्नेष्वाश्रमेषु विद्यायाः सद्भावाद्गृहिणोऽप्यस्तीति तेनोपसंहारः । तस्मात्सर्वाश्रमधर्मप्रदर्शनार्थो गृहिणोपसंहारः, इत्यभिप्रायः ॥ ४७ ॥

तथैतस्मिन्नपि वाक्ये

' ब्राह्मणाः पुत्रैषणायाश्च वित्तैषणायाश्च लोकैषणायाश्च व्युत्थायाथ भिक्षाचर्यं चरन्ति ' (बृ. ३।५।१)

इति पारिव्राज्यैकान्तधर्मं प्रतिपाद्य

---

[497] If it be (argued)—If in the case of learned people abiding in all the Āśramas, Vidyā helped by silence as the third, the co-worker with the duties of the various Āśramas, is spoken of as the means of attaining to Brahman; how then is appropriate the reference to staying in the state of a householder as long as one lives, in the *Chāndogya* beginning with

' On returning (from the preceptor's house, after finishing his studies) in the family, in a clean spot ' (Chā 8·15·1)

' He indeed, living thus, as long as he lives, attains to Brahman-world and does not return ' (Chā. 8·15·1)

— Here says (the Sūtrakāra)—

But on account of the existence in all, the inclusion of the householder ॥ 47 ॥

The word Tu turns away the objection Kṛtsnabhāvāt — on account of existence in all, on account of the existence of the Vidyā in all the followers of the Āśramas, it exists even in the case of the householder — and so there is the inclusion of that. Therefore the inclusion of the householder is for the sake of pointing out the duties of all the Āśramas — this is the intention ॥ 47 ॥

In the same way in this passage also—

' The Brāhmaṇas rising up from desire for sons, and from desire for wealth and from desire for the worlds — then wander about, leading the life of beggars. ' (Bṛ. 3·5·1)

—having propounded the exclusive duties of the state of renunciation, the statement in

'तस्माद्ब्राह्मणः पाण्डित्यं निर्विद्य'　　　　　　　　　　(बृ. ३।५।१)

इत्यादिना पारिव्राज्यधर्मस्थितिहेतुकमौनतृतीयसहकारिविधानं प्रदर्शनार्थमित्याह—

मौनवदितरेषामप्युपदेशात् ॥ ४८ ॥

सर्वेषणाविनिर्मुक्तस्य भिक्षाचरणपूर्वकमौनोपदेशः सर्वेषामाश्रमधर्माणां प्रदर्शनार्थः। कुतः ? एवंविधमौनोपदेशवदितरेषामाश्रमिणामपि

'त्रयो धर्मस्कन्धाः'　　　　　　　　　　(छा. २।२३।१)

इत्यारभ्य

'ब्रह्मसंस्थोऽमृतत्वमेति'　　　　　　　　　　(छा. २।२३।१)

इति ब्रह्मप्राप्त्युपदेशात्। उपपादितश्च पूर्वमेव ब्रह्मसंस्थशब्दः सर्वाश्रमिसाधारण इति। अतः सूक्तं यज्ञादिसर्वाश्रमधर्मवन्मौनतृतीयः पाण्डित्यादिर्विद्यासहकारित्वेन विधीयत इति ॥ ४८ ॥

सहकार्यन्तरविध्यधिकरणं समाप्तम् (१२)

अनाविष्कुर्वन्नन्वयात् ॥ ४९ ॥

(अधिकरण १३, सू. ४९)

[498]

'तस्माद्ब्राह्मणः पाण्डित्यं निर्विद्य बाल्येन तिष्ठासेत्'　　　　　　　　　　(बृ. ३।५।१)

'*Therefore, the Brāhmaṇa getting disgusted with scholarship*'　　　　　　　　　　(Br. 3·5·1)

etc., about Mauna being the third co-worker, the cause of the maintenance of the duties of the state of renunciation, is for the sake of illustration—so, says (the Sūtrakāra)—

Like silence, on account of the instruction in the case of others also ॥ 48 ॥

The instruction about silence preceded by wandering about for food in the case of one freed from all desires, is for the sake of illustrating the duties of all Āśramas. Whence? Because, like the instruction about this kind of silence, there is the instruction about the attainment of Brahman in the case of the followers of other Āśramas also, in (the passage) beginning with

'*The three pillars of Dharma*'　　　　　　　　　　(Chā. 2·23·1)

'*One stationed in Brahman goes to immortality*'　　　　　　　　　　(Chā. 2·23·1)

—The word Brahmasaṁstha has already been logically explained as being common to the followers of all Āśramas. Therefore, it has been well said,—like the duties of all Āśramas, sacrifice etc., scholarship etc, with silence as the third, are enjoined as being the co-workers of Vidyā. ॥ 48 ॥

Here ends the Sahakāryantaravidhyadhikaraṇa (12)

Not manifesting, on account of connection ॥ 49 ॥

(Adhikarana 13, Sūtra 49)

[498] Here in

'*Therefore, the Brāhmaṇa, getting disgusted with pedantry, should stay child-like*'　　　　　　　　　　(Br. 3·5·1)

इत्यत्र विदुषो बाल्यमुपादेयतया श्रुतम्। बालस्य भावः कर्म वा बाल्यम्। बालभावस्य वयोवस्थाविशेषस्यानुपादेयत्वात्कर्मैवेह गृह्यते। तत्र किं बालस्य कर्म कामचारादिकं सर्वं विदुषोपादेयम्, उत दम्भादिरहितमेव ? इति विशये, विशेषाभावात्सर्वमुपादेयम्। नियमशास्त्राणि च विशेषविधिनानेन बाध्यन्त इति।

एवं प्राप्ते, अभिधीयते—अनाविष्कुर्वन्, इति। बालस्य यत्स्वभावानाविष्काररूपं कर्म तदुपाददानो वर्तेत विद्वान्। कुतः ? अन्वयात्—तस्यैवान्वयात्।

'बाल्येन तिष्ठासेत्' (बृ ३।५।१)

इत्यस्मिन्विधौ तस्यैव ह्यन्वयसंभवः, इतरेषां विद्याविरोधित्वश्रवणात्

'नाविरतो दुश्चरितान्नाशान्तो नासमाहितः।
नाशान्तमानसो वापि प्रज्ञानेनैनमाप्नुयात् ॥' (का. २।२३)

'आहारशुद्धौ सत्त्वशुद्धिः' (छा. ७।२६।२)

इत्यादिषु ॥ ४९ ॥

अनाविष्काराधिकरणं समाप्तम् (१३)

ऐहिकमप्रस्तुतप्रतिबन्धे तद्दर्शनात् ॥ ५० ॥
(अधिकरण १४, सू. ५०)

[499] द्विविधा विद्याभ्युदयफला मुक्तिफला च। तत्राभ्युदयफला स्वसाधनभूते

---

the childlike nature is mentioned as fit to be taken to by a learned person. Bālyam — the state or act of a child. On account of the state of a child—a particular state of age —being incapable of being taken to, the act alone must be understood here. There the doubt (being raised) — Is the act of a child, behaving at one's sweet will etc., all that to be taken to by the wise one, or only being bereft of hypocrisy etc.?—(one view is) — Everything has got to be taken to, on account of the absence of any specific statement and the regulating Śāstra passages are contradicted by this specific injunction.

This (prima facie view) being reached, it is stated (in reply) — Anāviṣkurvan — A learned man should carry on, taking to what is the act of a child, of the nature of non-manifestation of its nature. Whence? Anvayāt — on account of the connection of that alone. In this injunction—

'One should stay child-like' (Br. 3·5·1)

— in this injunction there is the possibility of connection with that alone, on account of the others being mentioned as opposed to Vidyā in

'Not one who does not desist from wicked deeds, not one who is not concentrated, not again one with the mind not composed — but only by Prajñāna one would attain to this one' (Kā. 2·23)

'When the food is clean, there is the purity of Sattva' (Chā. 7·26·2)

etc. ॥ 49 ॥

Here ends the Anāviṣkārādhikaraṇa (13)

Belonging to this world, when the obstruction has not begun, on account of that being seen ॥ 50 ॥
(Adhikaraṇa 14, Sūtra 50)

[499] Vidyā is twofold — having material prosperity as the fruit,

पुण्यकर्मभिः कर्मानन्तरमेवोत्पद्यते, उत, अनन्तरं कालान्तरे वेत्यनियमः ? इति संशयः। पूर्वकृतैः पुण्यकर्मभिर्हि विद्वाञ्जायते। यथोक्तं भगवता

'चतुर्विधा भजन्ते मां जनाः सुकृतिनोऽर्जुन'　　(गीता ७।१६)

इति। साधने निर्वृत्ते विलम्बहेत्वभावादनन्तरमेवेति प्राप्ते, उच्यते—ऐहिकमप्रस्तुतप्रतिबन्धे, इति। ऐहिकम्—अभ्युदयफलमुपासनम्। अप्रस्तुतप्रतिबन्धे—अप्रस्तुते प्रबलकर्मान्तरप्रतिबन्धे सत्यनन्तरं, प्रतिबन्धे सति तदुत्तरकालमित्यानियमः। कुतः ? तद्दर्शनात्। दृश्यते हि प्रबलेन कर्मान्तरेण कर्मफलप्रतिबन्धाभ्युपगमः श्रुतौ

'यदेव विद्यया करोति श्रद्धयोपनिषदा तदेव वीर्यवत्तरम्'　(छा. १।१।१०)

इत्युद्गीथविद्यायुक्तस्य कर्मणः फलाप्रतिबन्धश्रवणात् ॥ ५० ॥

ऐहिकाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (१४)

एवं मुक्तिफलानियमस्तदवस्थावधृतेस्तदवस्थावधृतेः ॥ ५१ ॥

(अधिकरण १५, सू. ५१)

[500] मुक्तिफलस्याप्युपासनस्य स्वसाधनभूतैरतिशयितकर्मभिरुत्पत्तावेवमेव

---

and having salvation as the fruit There arises the doubt — Is the Vidyā with material prosperity as the fruit, produced immediately after the Karman through the meritorious acts that are the means at its command, or after a lapse of time,—thus no particular rule about it ? For, the wise one is born by virtue of the meritorious deeds done before; as has been said by the Lord—

'*Fourfold people, doers of good deeds, resort to me,* (O) *Arjuna.*'　　(Gītā 7·16)

— when the means have finished (the work) there is no cause for delay (for the production of the fruit) — so, verily, immediately after. This (prima facie view) being reached, it is said (in reply) — Aihikamaprastutabandhe — Aihika — the Upāsana with material (worldly) prosperity as the fruit. Aprastutapratibandhe — When the obstruction by another powerful Karman has not started (functioning) no interval; when there is the obstruction, at a time later than that -- and thus there is no rule. Whence ? Taddarśanāt — Because in the Śruti is admitted the obstruction to the fruit of the Karman by another powerful Karman, on account of the mention in the Śruti

'*Whatever one does by Vidyā, by faith, by the Upanisad, that alone* (is) *more powerful*'　　(Chā. 1·1·10)

of there being no obstruction to the fruit in the case of the Karman associated with the Udgīthavidyā. ॥ 50 ॥

Here ends the Aihikādhikaraṇa (14)

Thus no rule about that having salvation as the fruit, on account of the ascertainment of that state, on account of the ascertainment of that state ॥ 51 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 15, Sūtra 51)

[500] In the case of the worship with salvation as the fruit, also,

कालानियमः, तस्यापि पूर्ववत्प्रतिबन्धाभावप्रतिबन्धसंप्राप्तिरूपावस्थावधृतेः, अत्रापि तस्य हेतोः समानत्वादित्यर्थः। सर्वेभ्यः कर्मभ्यो मुक्तिफलविद्यासाधनस्य कर्मणः प्रबलत्वात्प्रतिबन्धासंभव इत्यधिकाशङ्का। तत्रापि ब्रह्मविदपचाराणां पूर्वकृतानां प्रबलानां संभवात्प्रतिबन्धसंभव इति परिहारः। द्विरुक्तिरध्यायपरिसमाप्तिं द्योतयति ॥ ५१ ॥

मुक्तिफलाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (१५)

इति श्रीभगवद्रामानुजाचार्यविरचिते शारीरकमीमांसाभाष्ये

तृतीयाध्यायस्य चतुर्थः पादः ॥

---

there is no rule about time in this very way in regard to the production (of the fruit) by the extremely important Karmans, that are the means for it: because in that case also, there is the ascertainment as before, of the state of the absence of the obstacle and that of being confronted with the obstacle—that is to say, here also, the cause would be the same. There is here an additional doubt — because the Karman which is the means of Vidyā having salvation for its fruit is more powerful than all the Karmans, there is no possibility of any obstacle. The refutation is — there also is the possibility of obstacles on account of the possibility of previous powerful misdeeds done by the Brahman-knowers. The repetition twice points out to the conclusion of the Chapter ॥ 51 ॥

Here ends the Muktiphalādhikaraṇa (15)

Here ends the Fourth Quarter of the Third Adhyāya of the Sārīraka-mīmāṁsābhāṣya by the Revered Preceptor Rāmānuja.

चतुर्थाध्याये प्रथमः पादः ।

आवृत्तिरसकृदुपदेशात् ॥ १ ॥

(अधिकरण १, सू. १–२)

[501] तृतीयेऽध्याये साधनैः सह विद्या चिन्तिता। अथेदानीं विद्यास्वरूपविशोधनपूर्वकं विद्याफलं चिन्त्यते। तत्र

'ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति परम्' (तै. २।१)

'तमेव विदित्वाति मृत्युमेति' (श्वे. ३।८)

'ब्रह्म वेद ब्रह्मैव भवति' (मु. ३।२।९)

'यदा पश्यः पश्यते रुक्मवर्णम्' (मु. ३।१।३)

इत्यादिवेदान्तवाक्येषु ब्रह्मप्राप्तिसाधनतया विहितं वेदनम्, किं सकृत्कृतमेव शास्त्रार्थः, उत, असकृदावृत्तम्? इति संशयः। किं युक्तम्? सकृत्कृतमिति। कुतः?

'ब्रह्म वेद ब्रह्मैव भवति' (मु. ३।२।९)

इति वेदनमात्रस्यैव विधानात्, असकृदावृत्तौ प्रमाणाभावात्। न चावघातादिवद्वेदनस्य ब्रह्मापरोक्ष्यं प्रति दृष्टोपायत्वात्, यावत्कार्यमावृत्तिरिति शक्यं वक्तुम्, वेदनस्य दृष्टोपायत्वाभावात्।

First Quarter of the Fourth Chapter

Repetition on account of the instruction more than once ॥ 1 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 1, Sūtras 1–2)

[501] In the third Adhyāya, Vidyā along with the means was taken for consideration. And now is considered the fruit of the Vidyā, preceded by the scrutiny into the nature of the Vidyā. There (arises) the doubt — Is the apprehension enjoined as being the means for the attainment to Brahman in the Vedānta passages

'*The Brahman-knower secures the Highest*' (Tai. 2·1)

'*Having known him alone, he goes beyond death*' (Śve. 3·8)

'*(He) who knows Brahman, becomes Brahman itself*' (Mu. 3·2·9)

'*When the seer sees the gold-coloured*' (Mu. 3·1·3)

etc.,— is the purport of the Śāstra to be gone through once, or is it to be repeated more than once?—What proper? To be gone through only once. Whence? Because there is no means of proof for understanding repetition more than once, on account of the enjoining of mere apprehension in

'*(He) who knows Brahman, becomes Brahman itself*' (Mu. 3·2·9)

Nor again is it possible to say that as in the case of pounding down etc., where there is the repetition till the effect is produced, because the remedy is (actually) seen, so in the case of apprehension as regards the direct realisation of Brahman.—Apprehension is not seen to be the means

ज्योतिष्टोमादिकर्माणि वेदान्तविहितं च वेदनं परमपुरुषाराधनरूपम्, आराधिताच्च परमपुरुषाद्धर्मार्थकाममोक्षाख्यपुरुषार्थावाप्तिः, इति हि

'फलमत उपपत्तेः' (ब्र. सू. ३।२।३७)

इत्यत्र प्रतिपादितम्। अतो ज्योतिष्टोमादिवद्यथाशब्दं सकृत्कृतमेव शास्त्रार्थः, इति प्राप्ते, प्रचक्ष्महे—आवृत्तिरसकृत्, इति। असकृदावृत्तमेव वेदनं शास्त्रार्थः। कुतः? उपदेशात्—ध्यानोपासनपर्यायेण वेदनशब्देनोपदेशात्। तत्पर्यायत्वं च विद्युपास्तिध्यायतीनामेकस्मिन्विषये वेदनोपदेशपरवाक्येषु प्रयोगादवगम्यते। तथाहि—

'मनो ब्रह्मेत्युपासीत' (छा. ३।१८।१)

इत्युपास्तिनोपक्रान्तोऽर्थः

'भाति च तपति च कीर्त्या यशसा ब्रह्मवर्चसेन य एवं वेद' (छा. ३।१८।३)

इति विदिनोपसंह्रियते। तथा

'यस्तद्वेद यत्स वेद स मयैतदुक्तः' (छा. ४।१।४)

इत्युपक्रमे विदिनोक्तं रैक्वस्य ज्ञानम्

(for the realisation of Brahman). The sacrificial rites, Jyotiṣṭoma etc., and the apprehension prescribed in the Vedāntas, are of the nature of propitiating the highest Puruṣa, and from the highest Puruṣa (thus) propitiated, there is the acquisition of the human purpose in life known as Dharma, Artha, Kāma and Mokṣa.— this indeed has been propounded in

'The fruit from this one, on account of the propriety'. (Bra. Sū. III 2·37)

Therefore, like the Jyotiṣṭoma etc., the intention of the Śāstra as actually worded, is (that the Vedana is) to be gone through only once.— This (prima facie view) being reached, we say (in reply) — Āvṛttirasakṛt — the purport of the Śāstra is that the apprehension should surely be gone through more than once. Whence? Upadeśāt — on account of the instruction by the word Vedana, *a synonym for Dhyāna, Upāsana. And its being a synonym of them* is apprehended by the use in the passages instructing the Vedana, of Vid (to know), Upās (to worship), Dhyai (to meditate), referring to one and the same thing. To explain the same—

The matter introduced with Upās in

'One should worship (upāsīta) mind as Brahman' (Chā. 3·18·1)

is concluded by Vid in

'Who thus knows (Veda) — he shines and scorches, by fame, glory and Brahmanical lustre' (Chā. 3·18·3)

—Similarly, the knowledge of Raikva mentioned by (the use of the root) Vid in the introductory part in

'Who knows that, what he knows — he has been told this by me' (Chā. 4·1·4)

is concluded by (the use of the root) Upās in

'अनु म एता भगवो देवता शाधि या देवतामुपास्से' (छा ४।२।२)

इत्युपासिनोपसंह्रियते। तथा

'ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति परम्' (तै २।१)

इत्यादिवाक्यसमानार्थेषु वाक्येषु

'आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यः श्रोतव्यो मन्तव्यो निदिध्यासितव्यः' (बृ २।४।५)

'ततस्तु तं पश्यते निष्कलं ध्यायमानः' (मु ३।१।८)

इत्यादिषु ध्यायतिना वेदनमभिधीयते। ध्यानं च चिन्तनम्। चिन्तनं च स्मृतिसंततिरूपं न स्मृतिमात्रम्। उपास्तिरपि तदेकार्थे, एकाग्रचित्तवृत्तिनैरन्तर्ये प्रयोगदर्शनात्। तदुभयैकार्थ्याद्सकृदावृत्तसंततस्मृतिरिह

'ब्रह्म वेद ब्रह्मैव भवति' (मु ३।२।९)

'ज्ञात्वा देवं मुच्यते सर्वपाशैः' (श्वे १।८)

इत्यादिषु वेदनादिशब्दैरभिधीयते, इति निश्चीयते॥ १॥

लिङ्गाच्च ॥ २ ॥

लिङ्गं स्मृतिः। स्मृतेश्चायमर्थोऽवगम्यते। स्मर्यते हि मोक्षसाधनभूतं वेदनं स्मृतिसंततिरूपम्

'Instruct me, Your Reverence, about this Deity—which deity you worship' (Chā 4 2 2)

Similarly in (passages) having similar import to that in

'The Brahman-knower secures the Highest' (Tai 2 1)

'The Ātman verily, my dear, should be seen should be thought of, should be meditated upon' (Br 2 4 5)

'There again, he sees, meditating upon that impartite' (Mu 3 1 8)

etc the Vedana is denoted by Dhyāyati And Dhyāna is meditation and meditation is of the form of a continuity of remembrance not merely remembrance And Upās also has the same sense as that, on account of its use being seen to denote the constant nature of the concentrated mental course So, both having one and the same sense the continuous remembrance repeated more than once is ascertained as being denoted by the words Vedana etc, in (passages)

'Who knows Brahman here, becomes Brahman itself' (Mu 3 2 9)

'Having known the shining one (God), he is freed from all bonds (nooses)' (Śve 1 8)

etc ‖ 1 ‖

And on account of the Smṛti ‖ 2 ‖

Liṅga—Smṛti This purport is also understood from the Smṛti For Vedana, the means of salvation, is described in the Smṛti-works as having the form of continuity of remembrance as in

'तद्रूपप्रत्यये चैका संततिश्चान्यनिःस्पृहा ।
तद्ध्यानं प्रथमैः षड्भिरङ्गैर्निष्पाद्यते तथा ॥'　　(वि. पु. ६।७।९१)

इति । तस्मादसकृदावृत्तमेव वेदनं शास्त्रार्थः ॥ २ ॥

आवृत्त्यधिकरणं समाप्तम् (१)

आत्मेति तूपगच्छन्ति ग्राहयन्ति च ॥ ३ ॥

(अधिकरण २, सू. ३)

[502] इदमिदानीं चिन्त्यते—किमुपास्यं ब्रह्म, उपासितुरन्यत्वेनोपास्यम्, उत, उपासितुरात्मत्वेन ? इति । किं युक्तम् ? अन्यत्वेन, इति । कुतः ? उपासितुः प्रत्यगात्मनोऽर्थान्तरत्वाद्ब्रह्मणः । अर्थान्तरत्वं च

'अधिकं तु भेदनिर्देशात्'　　(ब्र. सू. २।१।२२)
'अधिकोपदेशात्'　　(ब्र. सू. ३।४।८)
'नेतरोनुपपत्तेः'　　(ब्र. सू. १।१।१४)

इत्यादिषूपपादितम् । यथावस्थितं च ब्रह्मोपास्यम्, अयथावस्थितोपासने हि ब्रह्मप्राप्तिरप्ययथाभूता स्यात्

'यथाक्रतुरस्मिँल्लोके पुरुषो भवति तथेतः प्रेत्य भवति'　　(छा. ३।१४।१)

'For the apprehension of his form, there is only one continuous (apprehension) not depending upon another. That meditation is produced likewise by the first six factors (Yama, Niyama, etc.).'　　(V. P. 6·7·91)

Therefore the Śāstra-import — the Vedana, verily, is to be repeated more than once. ॥ 2 ॥

Here ends the Āvṛttyadhikaraṇa (1)

But they worship (Brahman) as Ātman, and (the Śāstras) make one comprehend (this) ॥ 3 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 2, Sūtra 3)

[502] This is now being considered — Is Brahman, the object of worship, to be worshipped as being different from the worshipper, or as being the Ātman of the worshipper ? What proper ? As being different. Whence ? Because Brahman is a different entity from the inmost Ātman, the worshipper. — (That Brahman is) a different entity, has been reasoned out in (the Sūtras)

'But additional, owing to the reference to difference'　　(Bra. Sū. II. 1·22)
'On account of the instruction of something more'　　(Bra. Sū III. 4·8)
'Not the other, on account of impropriety'　　(Bra. Sū. I. 1·14)

etc. And Brahman is to be worshipped as it is. For, if (Brahman) were to be worshipped as it is not, the attainment to Brahman would also be as it should not be, in accordance with the dictum—

'What will (sacrifice) a man has in this world, so he becomes, having departed from here.'　　(Chā. 3·14·1)

इति न्यायात् । अतोऽन्यत्वेनोपास्यमिति ।

एवं प्राप्ते, अभिधीयते—आत्मेति तु, इति । तुशब्दोऽवधारणे । उपासितुरात्मेत्ये-वोपास्यम् । उपासिता प्रत्यगात्मा स्वशरीरस्य स्वयं यथात्मा, तथा स्वात्मनोऽपि परं ब्रह्म, आत्मेत्येवोपासीतेत्यर्थः । कुतः ? एवं ह्युपगच्छन्ति पूर्वे उपासितारः

'त्वं वा अहमस्मि भगवो देवते अहं वै त्वमसि'   (वराहो २।३४)

इति । उपासितुरर्थान्तरभूतं ब्रह्मोपासितारोऽहमिति कथमभ्युपगच्छन्ति ? इत्यत्राह—ग्राहयन्ति च, इति । इममर्थमविरुद्धमुपासितॄन्ग्राहयन्ति शास्त्राणि । तान्प्रत्युपपादयन्तीत्यर्थः—

'य आत्मनि तिष्ठन्नात्मनोऽन्तरो यमात्मा न वेद यस्यात्मा शरीरं य आत्मानमन्तरो यमयति स त आत्मान्तर्याम्यमृतः'   (श ब्रा १४।१६।७।३०)

इति । तथा

'सन्मूलाः सोम्येमाः सर्वाः प्रजाः सदायतनाः सत्प्रतिष्ठाः'   (छा ६।८।६)

'ऐतदात्म्यमिदं सर्वम्'   (छा ६।८।७)

इति ।

'सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्म तज्जलान्'   (छा ३।१४।१)

इति च सर्वस्य चिदचिद्वस्तुनस्तज्जत्वात्, तल्लत्वात्, तदनत्वात्, तन्नियाम्यत्वात्, तच्छरीर-

---

Therefore, Brahman should be worshipped as being different—

This (prima facie view) being reached, it is stated (in reply)—Ātmeti tu—The word Tu is for emphasis (Brahman) is to be worshipped as the Ātman alone of the worshipper The worshipper, the inmost Ātman—just as he himself is the Ātman of his own body, in the same way, the Highest Brahman (is the Ātman) of one's own Ātman—that is to say, one should worship (Brahman) as the Ātman himself Whence ? For thus, indeed the former worshippers (used to) approach (the matter), as in

'You verily, I am, (O) divine deity, I, verily, you are'
(Varaho 2 34)

(If it is argued)—How could the worshippers approach Brahman as I, which is a different entity from the worshipper?—Here says (the Sutrakāra) Grāhayanti ca—this purport not conflicting, the Sāstras make the worshippers apprehend reason out for them—that (is) the sense (as) in—

Who, abiding in Ātman, (is) different from Ātman whom Ātman knows not whose body (is) Ātman, who controls the Ātman within—he, your Ātman, the inner Controller, immortal'
(Śa Bra 14 16·7 30)

Similarly in

'(O) gentle one, all these people have (their) root in Sat, (their) abode in Sat, stability in Sat'   (Chā 6 8 6)

'All this has this as the Ātman'   (Chā 6 8 7)

And in (the passage),

'All this verily, (is) Brahman, where it is originated, is merged and is sustained'   (Chā 3 14 1)

—on account of everything, sentient and non-sentient entities, being produced from it, merging into it, breathing forth into it, being controlled by it, and

त्वाच्च सर्वस्यायमात्मा। अतः स त आत्मा। अतो यथा प्रत्यगात्मनः स्वशरीरं प्रत्यात्मत्वाद्देवोऽहं मनुष्योऽहमित्यनुसंधानम्, तथा प्रत्यगात्मनोऽप्यात्मत्वात्परमात्मनः, तस्याप्यहमित्येवानुसंधानं युक्तमिति। एवं शास्त्रैरुपपादितम्। सर्वबुद्धीनां ब्रह्मैकनिष्ठत्वेन सर्वशब्दानां ब्रह्मैकनिष्ठत्वमभ्युपगच्छन्तः

'त्वं वा अहमस्मि भगवो देवते अहं वै त्वमसि भगवो देवते' (वराहो. २।३४)

इति व्यतिहारेणोक्तवन्तः। एवं च

'अथ योऽन्यां देवतामुपास्ते अन्योऽसावन्योऽहमस्मीति न स वेद' (बृ. १।४।१०)

'अकृत्स्नो ह्येषः ... आत्मेत्येवोपासीत' (बृ. १।४।७)

'सर्वं तं परादाद्योऽन्यत्रात्मनः सर्वं वेद' (बृ. २।४।६)

इत्यात्मत्वाननुसंधाननिषेधः,

'पृथगात्मानं प्रेरितारं च मत्वा' (श्वे. १।६)

इति पृथक्त्वानुसंधानविधानं चाविरुद्धम्। अहमिति स्वात्मतयानुसंधानादन्यत्वानुसंधाननिषेधो रक्षितः। स्वशरीरात्स्वात्मनोऽधिकत्वानुसंधानवत्स्वात्मनोऽपि परमात्मनोऽधिकत्वानु-

---

being his body; therefore this (is) the Ātman of all. Therefore, he is your Ātman. Therefore, just as, because the inmost Ātman is the Ātman in respect of his own body, there is the continued cognition—I am a god,—I am a man,—in the same way, because the Paramātman is the Atman even of the inmost Ātman, the continued cognition—I (am)—is quite proper in him also. This has been set forth by the Śāstra-passages. Because all cognitions are centred in Brahman alone, those admitting all words to be pointing out to Brahman alone, spoke by mutual identification—as

'You, verily, I am, (O) divine deity, I, verily, you are, (O) divine deity,' (Varāho. 2·34)

And again thus, in (the passages)—

'Now, (he) who worships another deity as—that (is) different (from) me, I am different—he knows not' (Br. 1·4·10)

This one, verily, (is) not complete.. one should worship as Ātman alone' (Br. 1·4·7)

'Everything deserts him who knows everything as apart from Ātman' (Br. 2·4·6)

the repudiation of the non-continued cognition of the nature of Ātman, and the enjoining of the cognition as being different, in

'Having thought of the Ātman separately as the Impeller' (Śve. 1·6)

are not conflicting. By the continued cognition of being one's own Ātman as I, the repudiation of continued cognition about something different has been secured; like the continued cognition of Ātman being over and above one's body, on account of the continued cognition of the Paramātman being over and

संधानात्पृथक्त्वानुसंधानविधानं च रक्षितम्। अधिकस्य ब्रह्मणः प्रत्यगात्मन आत्मत्वात्तस्य च ब्रह्मशरीरत्वान्निषेधवाक्ये

'अकृत्स्नो ह्येषः' (बृ. १।४।७)

इत्युक्तम्। अत उपासितुरात्मत्वेन ब्रह्मोपास्यमिति स्थितम्॥ ३॥

आत्मत्वोपासनाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (२)

न प्रतीके न हि सः॥ ४॥

(अधिकरण ३, सू. ४—५)

[503]

'मनो ब्रह्मेत्युपासीत' (छा. ३।११।१)

'स यो नाम ब्रह्मेत्युपास्ते' (छा. ७।१।५)

इत्यादिप्रतीकोपासनेष्वप्यात्मत्वानुसंधानं कार्यम्, उत नेति चिन्तायाम्

'मनो ब्रह्मेत्युपासीत' (छा. ३।११।१)

इति ब्रह्मोपासनत्वसाम्याद्ब्रह्मणश्चोपासितुरात्मत्वात्, आत्मेत्येवोपासीतेत्येवं प्राप्ते, अभिधीयते—न प्रतीके, इति। प्रतीके नात्मत्वानुसंधानं कार्यम्। न हि सः—न ह्युपासितुरात्मा प्रतीकः। प्रतीकोपासनेषु प्रतीक एवोपास्यो न ब्रह्म। ब्रह्म तु तत्र दृष्टिविशेषणमात्रम्। प्रतीकोपासनं हि नाम, अब्रह्मणि ब्रह्मदृष्ट्यनुसंधानम्। तत्रोपास्यस्य प्रतीकस्योपासितुरात्मत्वाभावात्, न

---

above even one's own Ātman, the reference to continued cognition about separateness is also secured; because Brahman which is over and above is the Ātman of the inmost Ātman and that (Ātman) is the body of Brahman, it has been stated in the repudiation-passage—

'This one (is) not complete' (Br. 1·4·7)

Therefore, it is established that Brahman is the object of worship as the Ātman of the worshipper ॥ 3 ॥

Here ends the Ātmatvopāsanādhikaraṇa (2)

Not in the symbol, not indeed, he ॥ 4 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 3, Sūtras 4–5)

[503] Even in the case of the symbolic Upāsanās in (the passages)

'One should worship the mind as Brahman' (Chā. 3·11·1)

'He who worships the name as Brahman' (Chā. 7·1·5)

etc., — while considering whether the continued cognition as Ātman should be accepted or not, (the prima facie view) being reached — on account of the similarity to the worship of Brahman as in

'One should worship the mind as Brahman' (Chā. 3·11·1)

and on account of Brahman being the Ātman of the worshipper, (it is as good as stated that) one should worship as Ātman alone — it is stated in reply—Na pratīke — In the case of the symbol, cognition as Ātman should not be gone through. Na, hi sah — not indeed, is the Ātman of the worshipper a symbol. In the case of the symbol-worships, the symbol alone is the object of worship, not Brahman; Brahman again is there merely a particular qualifying aspect; for, symbol-worship is, for the matter of that, the cognition of the aspect (superimposition) of Brahman, as regards the non-Brahman. There

तथानुसंधेयम् ॥ ४ ॥

नन्वत्रापि ब्रह्मैवोपास्यम्, ब्रह्मण उपास्यत्वसंभवे मनआदीनामचेतनानामल्पशक्तीनां चोपास्यत्वाश्रयणस्यान्याय्यत्वात् । अतो मनआदिदृष्ट्या ब्रह्मैवोपास्यमिति—तत्राह—

ब्रह्मदृष्टिरुत्कर्षात् ॥ ५ ॥

मनआदिषु ब्रह्मदृष्टिरेव युक्ता । न ब्रह्मणि मनआदिदृष्टिः, ब्रह्मणो मनआदिभ्य उत्कर्षात्, तेषां च विपर्ययात् । उत्कृष्टे हि राजनि भृत्यदृष्टिः प्रत्यवायकरी, भृत्ये तु राजदृष्टिरभ्युदयाय ॥ ५ ॥

प्रतीकाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (३)

आदित्यादिमतयश्चाङ्ग उपपत्तेः ॥ ६ ॥

(अधिकरण ४, सू. ६)

[504]

'य एवासौ तपति तमुद्गीथमुपासीत' (छा १।३।१)

इत्यादिषु कर्माङ्गाश्रयेषूपासनेषु संशयः—किमुद्गीथादौ कर्माङ्ग आदित्यादिदृष्टिः कर्तव्या, उत,

---

as the symbol is not the Ātman of the worshipper, that is not to be cognised in that way ॥4॥

I say (says the objector)—Here also Brahman alone is the object of worship; when there is the possibility of Brahman being the object of worship, the mind etc., that are non-sentient with meagre power, as being the resorts of the object of worship, cannot be justified. Therefore Brahman alone is to be worshipped with mind etc., superimposed upon it—There says (the Sūtrakāra)

Superimposition of Brahman, on account of pre-eminence ॥ 5 ॥

The superimposition of Brahman alone upon mind etc., (is) proper,—not the superimposition of mind etc., upon Brahman, because Brahman has pre-eminence over mind etc., and because they (mind etc.,) are the opposite of that. Indeed, the superimposition of a servant upon the superior king would create trouble, but the superimposition of the king upon the servant (is) conducive to prosperity. ॥5॥

Here ends the Pratīkādhikaraṇa (3)

Superimpositions of Āditya etc., on the parts (of the rite) on account of propriety ॥ 6 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 4, Sūtra 6)

[504] In the case of the worships resorting to the parts of (the sacrificial) rite etc., in (the passage)

'Who alone, this one shines, one should worship him as Udgītha' (Chā. 1·3·1)

etc., (there arises) a doubt—Is the superimposition of the Sun etc, to be made on the parts of the sacrificial rite, Udgītha etc.,—or the superimposition of Udgītha etc, upon Āditya etc?—In accordance with the dictum, the superimposition of one superior should be made upon one inferior, because Udgītha etc., are

आदित्यादिषूद्गीथादिदृष्टिः ? इति। उत्कृष्टदृष्टिर्निकृष्टे कर्तव्येति न्यायादुद्गीथादीनां च फलसाधनभूतकर्माङ्गत्वेन, अफलेभ्य आदित्यादिभ्य उत्कृष्टत्वात्, आदित्यादिषूद्गीथादिदृष्टिः, इति प्राप्ते, अभिधीयते—आदित्यादिमतयश्चाङ्गे, इति। चशब्दोऽवधारणे। क्रत्वङ्ग उद्गीथादावादित्यादिदृष्टय एव कार्याः। कुतः ? उपपत्तेः—आदित्यादीनामेवोत्कृष्टत्वोपपत्तेः। आदित्यादिदेवताराधनद्वारेण हि कर्मणामपि फलसाधनत्वम्। अतस्तद्दृष्टिरुद्गीथाद्यङ्गे ॥ ६ ॥

आदित्यादिमत्यधिकरणं समाप्तम् (४)

आसीनः संभवात् ॥ ७ ॥

(अधिकरण ५, सूत्राणि ७–११)

[505] मोक्षसाधनतया वेदान्तशास्त्रैर्विहितं ज्ञानं ध्यानोपासनादिशब्दवाच्यम्, असकृदावृत्तं संततस्मृतिरूपम्, इत्युक्तम्। तदनुतिष्ठन्नासीनः, उत, आसीनः शयानस्तिष्ठन्गच्छंश्च, विशेषाभावादनियमेनानुतिष्ठेदिति प्राप्ते, उच्यते—आसीनः, इति। आसीन उपासनमनुतिष्ठेत्। कुतः ? संभवात्—आसीनस्यैव ह्येकाग्रचित्ततासंभवः, स्थितिगत्योः प्रयत्नसापेक्षत्वात्, शयाने च निद्रासंभवात्। पश्चार्धधारणप्रयत्ननिवृत्तये सापाश्रय आसीनः कुर्यात् ॥ ७ ॥

ध्यानाच्च ॥ ८ ॥

---

superior to the Sun etc., that are without any fruit-being subsidiary to the rite, the means of the fruit, the superimposition of Udgītha etc, on the Sun etc., (should be there)—This (prima facie view) being reached, it is stated (in reply)—Ādityādimatayaścānge. The word Ca is for the sake of emphasis. The superimpositions of Āditya etc., upon Udgītha etc., a part of the sacrifice, alone are to be made. Whence? Upapatteh.—On account of the propriety of the superiority of Āditya etc., alone; for, even the rites are the means for the fruit, through the propitiation of the deities Āditya etc., and so their superimposition upon the parts, Udgītha etc. ॥ 6 ॥

Here ends the Ādityādimatyadhikarana (4)

While sitting, on account of the possibility ॥ 7 ॥

(Adhikarana 5, Sūtras 7–11)

[505] It has been stated that knowledge prescribed in the Vedānta-Sāstras as the means of salvation denoted by the words—Dhyāna, Upāsanā, etc., being repeated more than once is of the form of continuous remembrance. While going through that, there being no specific mention whether one should do this, sitting (as a rule), or one (should be) sitting, sleeping, standing, moving,—one should carry on indiscriminately—This (prima facie view) being reached, it is said (in reply)—Āsīnah—one should carry on with the worship, sitting. Whence? Sambhavāt—for, there is the possibility of the concentration of the mind in the case of one sitting only; because, standing and moving stand in need of some effort, and there is the possibility of sleep while lying down. In order to avoid the effort for supporting the lower half of the body, one should carry on (the worship) while sitting without any support. ॥ 7 ॥

And on account of meditation ॥ 8 ॥

'निदिध्यासितव्यः' (बृ. २।४।५)

इति ध्यानरूपत्वादुपासनस्यैकाग्रचित्ततावश्यंभाविनी। ध्यानं हि विजातीयप्रत्ययान्तराव्यवहितमेकचिन्तनमित्युक्तम् ॥ ८ ॥

अचलत्वं चापेक्ष्य ॥ ९ ॥

निश्चलत्वं चापेक्ष्य पृथिव्यन्तरिक्षादिषु ध्यानवाचोयुक्तिर्दृश्यते

'ध्यायतीव पृथिवी ध्यायतीवान्तरिक्षं ध्यायतीव द्यौर्ध्यायन्तीवापो ध्यायन्तीव पर्वताः' (छा. ७।६।१)

इति। अतः पृथिवीपर्वतादिवदेकाग्रचित्ततया निश्चलत्वमुपासकस्यासीनस्यैव संभवेत् ॥ ९ ॥

स्मरन्ति च ॥ १० ॥

स्मरन्ति चासीनस्यैव ध्यानम्

'शुचौ देशे प्रतिष्ठाप्य स्थिरमासनमात्मनः।
नात्युच्छ्रितं नातिनीचं चैलाजिनकुशोत्तरम् ॥
तत्रैकाग्रं मनः कृत्वा यतचित्तेन्द्रियक्रियः।
उपविश्यासने युञ्ज्याद्योगमात्मविशुद्धये ॥' (गीता ६·११–१२)

इति ॥ १० ॥

In the case of worship, it is essential that there should be perfect concentration of the mind, as the worship is of the nature of meditation, as in

'He should be meditated upon' (Br. 2·4·5)

—for, it is said that Dhyāna is meditation upon one thing, not obstructed by other heterogenous apprehensions. ॥ 8 ॥

And taking into account the unshakable state ॥ 9 ॥

And taking into account the state of being unshakable, there is seen the use of Dhyāna, speech, as referring to the Earth, mid-region etc., in

'The earth as though meditates, the mid-region as though meditates, the sky as though meditates, the waters as though meditate, the mountains as though meditate' (Chā. 7·6·1)

—Therefore, as in the earth, mountain, etc., motionlessness on account of the mind being concentrated is possible in the case of the worshipper only while sitting. ॥ 9 ॥

And the Smṛtis also mention ॥ 10 ॥

The Smṛti-works mention meditation in the case of one only when sitting—

'Having established in a clean region a firm seat for oneself, neither too high, nor too low, with the deer-skin and the Kuśa grass placed upon it—

'There sitting on that seat, having concentrated one's mind, with the functions of the mind and sense-organs controlled, one should practise Yoga for self-purification.' (Gītā 6·11–12)

॥ 10 ॥

यत्रैकाग्रता तत्राविशेषात् ॥ ११ ॥

एकाग्रतातिरिक्तदेशकालविशेषाश्रवणादेकाग्रतानुकूलो यो देशः कालश्च स एवोपासनस्य देशः कालश्च।

'समे शुचौ शर्करावह्निवालुकाविवर्जिते' (श्वे. २।१०)

इति वचनमेकाग्र्यैकान्तमाह, न तु देशं नियच्छति

'मनोऽनुकूले' (श्वे २।१०)

इति वाक्यशेषात् ॥ ११ ॥

आसीनाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (५)

आ प्रयाणात्तत्रापि हि दृष्टम् ॥ १२ ॥

(अधिकरण ६, सू. १२)

[506] तदिदमपवर्गसाधनमुक्तलक्षणमुपासनम्, एकाह एव संपाद्यम्, उत, आ प्रयाणात्प्रत्यहमनुवर्तनीयम्, इति विशये, एकस्मिन्नेवाहनि शास्त्रार्थस्य कृतत्वात्तावतैव परिसमापनीयम्, इति प्राप्ते, उच्यते—आ प्रयाणात्, इति। आ मरणादनुवर्तनीयम्। कुतः ? तत्रापि हि दृष्टम्—उपासनोद्योगप्रभृति, आ प्रयाणान्मध्ये यः कालस्तत्र सर्वत्रापि दृष्टमुपासनम्

Where concentration, there, on account of no specific mention ॥ 11 ॥

There being no mention in the Śruti about any specific region or specific time, apart from concentration whatever region and time favourable to concentration,—those alone should be the region and time for the worship. The statement in (the passage)

'On an even clear (region) from which are removed lime-sand, fire and sand' (Śve 2·10)

refers exclusively to concentration, but it does not restrict (the worshipper) to any region, on account of the remaining passage

'Agreeable to the mind' (Śve. 2·10)

॥ 11 ॥

Here ends the Āsīnādhikaraṇa (5)

Upto death, for there also is seen ॥ 12 ॥

(Adhikarana 6, Sūtra 12)

[506] There being the doubt — whether this worship, the means of salvation, with the aforesaid characteristics should be finished in just one day, or it is to be repeated day after day right up to the departure (death) — (the prima facie view) — In just one day it (the worship) should be completed, with that much only, on account of the purport of the Sāstra-passage being gone through in only one day. — This (prima facie view) being reached, it is said (in reply) — Ā prayāṇāt — it should be followed till death. Whence ? Tatrāpi hi dṛṣṭam — whatever time elapses in between, from the starting of the worship up to death, there everywhere also is seen the worship, as in

'स खल्वेवं वर्तयन्यावदायुषं ब्रह्मलोकमभिसंपद्यते' (छा. ८।१५।१)

इति ॥ १२ ॥

आप्रयाणाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (६)

तदधिगम उत्तरपूर्वाघयोरश्लेषविनाशौ तद्व्यपदेशात् ॥ १३ ॥

(अधिकरण ७, सू. १३)

[507] एवं विद्यास्वरूपं विशोध्य विद्याफलं चिन्तयितुमारभते। ब्रह्मविद्याप्राप्तौ पुरुषस्योत्तरपूर्वाघयोरश्लेषविनाशौ श्रूयेते—

'तद्यथा पुष्करपलाश आपो न श्लिष्यन्त एवमेवंविदि पापं कर्म न श्लिष्यते' (छा. ४।१४।३)

'तस्यैवात्मा पदवित्तं विदित्वा न कर्मणा लिप्यते पापकेन' (बृ ४।४।२३)

इत्युत्तराघाश्लेषः।

'तद्यथेषीकातूलमग्नौ प्रोतं प्रदूयेतैवं हास्य सर्वे पाप्मानः प्रदूयन्ते' (छा. ५।२४।३)

'क्षीयन्ते चास्य कर्माणि तस्मिन्दृष्टे परावरे' (मु २।२।८)

इति पूर्वाघविनाशः।

एतावश्लेषविनाशौ विद्याफलभूतावुपपद्येते, न वा, इति संशयः— किं युक्तम्?

'He, indeed, behaving thus till life, attains to the Brahmaloka' (Chā 8·15·1)

॥12॥

Here ends the Āprayāṇādhikaraṇa (6)

On its acquisition, non-contact and destruction of future and past sins, on account of the reference to that ॥ 13 ॥

(Adhikarana 7, Sūtra 13)

[507] Having thus laid under scrutiny the nature of Vidyā, (the Sūtrakāra) begins to consider the fruit of the Vidyā On the acquisition of the knowledge of Brahman, are mentioned in the Sruti, the non-contact and destruction (respectively) of the future and past sins in the case of a person. In (the passages)—

'That, as the waters on a lotus-leaf do not stick (to it), thus, the sinful deed sticks not in the case of one who knows thus' (Chā. 4·14·3)

'Only his Ātman, the knower of the place, having known him, is not contaminated by the sinful Karman' (Br. 4·4·23)

—there is the non-contact with the later sin In (the passages)—

'That, as the cotton on the brick cast into the fire is damaged, thus indeed in his case, are all sins damaged' (Chā 5·24·3)

'And his deeds are destroyed, when is seen that, high and low' (Mu. 2·2·8)

— there is the destruction of the past sin.

— The doubt arises whether these, non-contact and destruction, which

नोपपद्येते, इति। कुतः ?

'नाभुक्तं क्षीयते कर्म कल्पकोटिशतैरपि' (ब्रह्मवै. २६।७०)

इत्यादिशास्त्रविरोधात्। अश्लेषविनाशव्यपदेशस्तु मोक्षसाधनभूतविद्याविधायिवाक्यशेषगतः कथंचिद्विद्यास्तुतिप्रतिपादनेनाप्युपपद्यते। न च विद्या पूर्वोत्तराघयोः प्रायश्चित्ततया विधीयते येन प्रायश्चित्तेनाघविनाश उच्येत। विद्या हि

'ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति परम्' (तै. २।१)

'ब्रह्म वेद ब्रह्मैव भवति' (मु. ३।२।९)

इति ब्रह्मप्राप्त्युपायतया विधीयते। अतो विद्यास्तुत्यर्थवादोऽयमघविनाशाश्लेषव्यपदेशः, इति।

एवं प्राप्ते, अभिधीयते—तदधिगमे, इति। विद्याप्राप्तौ पुरुषस्य विद्यामाहात्म्यादुत्तरपूर्वाघयोरश्लेषविनाशावुपपद्येते। कुतः ? एवंविधं हि विद्यामाहात्म्यमवगम्यते

'एवंविदि पापं कर्म न श्लिष्यते' (छा. ४।१४।३)

'एवं हास्य सर्वे पाप्मानः प्रदूयन्ते' (छा. ५।२४।३)

इत्यादिव्यपदेशात्। न च

---

are the fruit of the Vidyā are proper or not? What (is) reasonable? They are not proper. Whence? On account of the conflict with the Śāstra

'*Karman, unless it is enjoyed, cannot be destroyed even in hundreds of crores of aeons*' (Brahmavai. 26-70)

etc. The reference to the non-contact and destruction, for the matter of that, which is found in the concluding portion of the passage enjoining Vidyā, the means of salvation, can somehow be accounted for, also by taking that to be for the praise of Vidyā. Nor again is Vidyā enjoined as an atonement for past and future sins, so that the destruction of the sin could have been spoken of as due to the atonement. For, Vidyā is enjoined as a means of the acquisition of Brahman, in

'*The Brahman-knower secures the Highest*' (Tai. 2·1)

'*Who knows Brahman, (he) becomes Brahman itself.*' (Mu. 3·2·9)

Therefore, this reference to non-contact and destruction of the sin is just a glorificatory statement in praise of Vidyā —

This (prima facie view) being reached, it is stated (in reply) — Tadadhigame — On the acquisition of the Vidyā in the case of a person, on account of the greatness of Vidyā, the non-contact and the destruction of the future and past sins, are proper. Whence? For such indeed is known to be the greatness of Vidyā, on account of the reference in

'*To one who knows thus, the sinful deed sticks not*' (Chā. 4·14·3)

'*Thus indeed all his sins are damaged*' (Chā. 5·24·3)

etc. Not is there any contradiction with this reference, in

'*नाभुक्तं क्षीयते कर्म*' (ब्रह्मवै. २६।७०)

इत्यनेनास्य विरोधः, भिन्नविषयत्वात्। तद्धि कर्मणां फलजननसामर्थ्यदार्ढ्यविषयम्। एतत्तु, उत्पन्नाया विद्यायाः प्राक्कृतानां पाप्मनां फलजननशक्तिविनाशसामर्थ्यम्, उत्पत्स्यमानानां च फलजननशक्त्युत्पत्तिप्रतिबन्धकरणसामर्थ्यं च प्रतिपादयति, इति द्वयोर्विषयो भिद्यते। यथा, अग्निजलयोरौष्ण्यतन्निवारणसामर्थ्यविषययोर्द्वयोः प्रमाणयोरपि विषयभेदात्प्रामाण्यम्, एवमत्रापीति न कश्चिद्विरोधः। अघस्याश्लेषकरणं वैदिककर्मायोग्यतावासनाप्रत्यवायहेतुशक्त्युत्पत्तिप्रतिबन्धकरणम्। अघानि हि कृतानि पुरुषस्य वैदिककर्मायोग्यतां सजातीयकर्मान्तरारम्भरुचिं प्रत्यवायं च कुर्वन्ति। अघस्य विनाशकरणमुत्पन्नायास्तच्छक्तेर्विनाशकरणम्। शक्तिरपि परमपुरुषाप्रीतिरेव। तदेवं विद्या वेदितुर्वेद्यात्यर्थप्रियत्वेन स्वयमेव निरतिशयप्रिया सती वेद्यभूतपरमपुरुषाराधनस्वरूपा पूर्वकृताघसंचयजनितपरमपुरुषाप्रीतिं विनाशयति। सैव विद्या स्वोत्पत्त्युत्तरकालभाव्यघनिमित्तपरमपुरुषाप्रीत्युत्पत्तिं च प्रतिबध्नाति। तदिदमश्लेषवचनं प्रामादिकविषयं मन्तव्यम्

'नाविरतो दुश्चरिताद्' (का. २।२४)

'*Not again is destroyed Karman which is not enjoyed*'
(Brahmavai. 26·70)

because the subject-matter is different. For, that indeed refers to the firmness of the strength to produce the fruit in the case of the Karmans But this propounds in the case of Vidyā that is produced, the power to destroy the capacity of producing the fruit of sins done before, and also the power to put forth obstacles in the production of the capacity to produce fruit in the case of sins that are yet to come into being — and so, the subject-matter in the case of the two is different. Just as even in the case of the two means of proof, referring to the power of (producing) heat and the warding off of it (respectively), in the case of fire and water, there is the authoritative nature, on account of the difference of the subject-matter; so here also, thus there is no contradiction. Effecting non-contact with the sin is the causing obstruction to the production of the power, the cause of impediment to the Vāsanā associated with unfitness for any sacrificial rite; for, the sins done produce in a person unfitness for a sacrificial act, a taste for doing other similar Karman, and obstruction. Bringing about destruction in the case of the sin, is the effecting of destruction of that power produced. The power also is the non-gratification itself of the highest Puruṣa. And thus Vidyā being itself unsurpassingly dear to the knower owing to its being exceedingly dear to the object of knowledge, being of the form of the worship of the highest Puruṣa who is to be known, destroys non-gratification of the highest Puruṣa, caused by the collection of sins done in the past. And that same Vidyā also obstructs the production of non-gratification of the highest Puruṣa, caused by sin that is to come into being in times later than its own production. So, this statement about non-contact should be regarded as confined to something what is done through mistake, because by the Sāstric passages

'*Not desisting from bad deeds*' (Kā. 2·24)

इत्यादिभिः शास्त्रैरा प्रयाणादहरहरुत्पद्यमानाया उत्तरोत्तरातिशयभागिन्या विद्याया दुश्चरितविरतिनिष्पाद्यत्वावगमात् ॥ १३ ॥

तदधिगमाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (७)

इतरस्याप्येवमसंश्लेषः पाते तु ॥ १४ ॥

(अधिकरण ८, सू. १४)

[508] उत्तरपूर्वाघयोर्विद्यया, अश्लेषविनाशावुक्तौ। इतरस्य पुण्यस्याप्येवमुक्तेन न्यायेनाश्लेषविनाशौ विद्यया स्याताम्, विद्याफलविरोधित्वसामान्यात्, व्यपदेशाच्च। भवति च व्यपदेश उभे सुकृतदुष्कृते निर्दिश्य

'सर्वे पाप्मानोऽतो निवर्तन्ते'　　　　(छा. ८।४।१)

इति।

'तत्सुकृतदुष्कृते धुनुते'　　　　(कौ १।४)

इति च। मुमुक्षोरनिष्टफलत्वात्सुकृतस्यापि पाप्मशब्देन व्यपदेशः। सुकृतस्य शास्त्रीयत्वात्तत्फलस्य केषांचिदिष्टत्वदर्शनाच्च विद्याविरोधशङ्कां निवर्तयितुमतिदेशः। ननु विदुषोऽपि सेतिकर्तव्यताकोपासननिर्वृत्तये वृष्ट्यन्नादिफलानीष्टान्येव। कथं तेषां विरोधाद्विनाश उच्यते?

---

etc., Vidyā which is being produced day by day right up to death, and which is becoming stronger and stonger, is known to be capable of being produced by the cessation of evil deeds. ॥ 13 ॥

Here ends the Tadadhigamādhikaraṇa (7)

Thus, non-contact with other also, but at the fall ॥ 14 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 8, Sūtra 14)

[508] The non-contact and destruction of future and past sins by the Vidyā have been stated. In accordance with the aforesaid dictum, there would be the non-contact and destruction, itarasya — of the other — of merit also, by the Vidyā on account of being contrary to the fruit of Vidyā being common and on account of the reference. And there *is*, indeed, a reference pointing out to both good deeds and evil deeds, in

'All sins turn away from him'　　　　(Chā. 8·4·1)

and also in

'Shakes off his good deeds and evil deeds'.　　　　(Kau 1·4)

A good deed also is referred to as sin, because that produces an undesirable fruit for one desirous of salvation This is an extension of the application (of the rule) to turn away the doubt that a good deed might not be opposed by the Vidyā, because it is prescribed in the Sāstra and its fruit is seen to be desirable in the case of some. I say (says the objector) — Even in the case of the wise one (Brahman-knower) the fruits, the shower of rain, food, etc, for the purpose of completing the Upāsanā (worship) with its full procedure are, to be sure, desirable. How can their destruction due to opposition be spoken of?

तत्राह—पाते तु, इति। शरीरपाते तु तेषां विनाशः। शरीरपातादूर्ध्वं तु विद्यानुगुणदृष्टफलानि सुकृतानि नश्यन्तीत्यर्थः ॥ १४ ॥

इतराधिकरणं समाप्तम् (८)

अनारब्धकार्ये एव तु पूर्वे तदवधेः ॥ १५ ॥

(अधिकरण ९, सू. १५)

[509] ब्रह्मविद्योत्पत्तेः पूर्वोत्तरभाविनोः सुकृतदुष्कृतयोरश्लेषविनाशावुक्तौ। ततः पूर्वभाविनोः सुकृतदुष्कृतयोः किमविशेषेण विनाशः, उत, अनारब्धकार्ययोरेव ? इति विशये

' सर्वे पाप्मानः प्रदूयन्ते ' (छा. ५।२४।३)

इति विद्याफलस्याविशेषश्रवणाद्विद्योत्पत्त्युत्तरकालभाविन्याश्च शरीरस्थितेः कुलालचक्रभ्रमणादिवत्संस्कारवशादप्युपपत्तेः, अविशेषेणेति प्राप्ते, उच्यते—अनारब्धकार्ये एव तु पूर्वे, इति। विद्योत्पत्तेः पूर्वे सुकृतदुष्कृते अनारब्धकार्ये अप्रवृत्तफले एव विद्यया विनश्यतः। कुतः ? तदवधेः—

' तस्य तावदेव चिरं यावन्न विमोक्ष्येऽथ संपत्स्ये ' (छा. ६।१४।२)

— There says (the Sūtrakāra) Pāte tu — but on the fall of the body, their destruction (takes place) — that is to say, only after the fall of the body, perish the good deeds with the fruits seen as favouring the Vidyā ‖ 14 ‖

Here ends the Itarādhikaraṇa (8)

But the past that have not started to give fruit, alone, on account of the delay up to that ‖ 15 ‖

(Adhikaraṇa 9, Sūtra 15)

[509] The non-contact and destruction of good and evil deeds, existing prior and posterior to the rise of the Brahmavidyā have been stated. Thereupon, the doubt being there — Is there destruction without any distinction of good and evil deeds, existing in the past, or, only of those which have not yet started to function ? Because in

' All sins are damaged ' (Chā. 5·24·3)

the fruit of the Vidyā is not mentioned in a specific way, and the existence of the body continuing in the time posterior to the production of Vidyā, being accounted for even on the strength of the impressions, as in the case of the revolving of the potter's wheel, (the destruction is) without any qualification,— this (prima facie view) being reached, — it is stated (in reply)— Anārabdhakārye eva tu pūrve — the good and evil deeds, — Pūrve — prior to the production of the Vidyā, — Anārabdhakārye — that have not started, indeed, to give their fruit, alone perish by the Vidyā. Whence ? Tadavadheḥ — On account of the time for the delay till the fall of the body being mentioned in the Śruti

' For him there is delay only so long as he is not freed, then he gets merged ' (Chā. 6·14·2)

इति शरीरपातविलम्बावाधिश्रुतेः । न च पुण्यापुण्यकर्मजन्यभगवत्प्रीत्यप्रीतिव्यतिरेकेण शरीरस्थितिहेतुभूतसंस्कारसद्भावे प्रमाणमस्ति ॥ १५ ॥

अनारब्धकार्याधिकरणं समाप्तम् (९)

अग्निहोत्रादि तु तत्कार्यायैव तद्दर्शनात् ॥ १६ ॥

(अधिकरण १०, सूत्राणि १६–१८)

[510]

'इतरस्याप्येवमसंश्लेषः' (ब्र. सू. ४।१।१४)

इति विद्याबलात्सुकृतस्याप्यसंश्लेष उक्तः । अग्निहोत्रादीनां नित्यनैमित्तिकानां स्वाश्रमधर्माणामपि सुकृतत्वसामान्येन तत्फलस्याश्लेषादनिच्छतोऽननुष्ठाने प्राप्ते, उच्यते—अग्निहोत्रादि तु, इति । तुशब्दः सुकृतान्तरेभ्यो विशेषार्थः । अग्निहोत्राद्याश्रमधर्माः फलाश्लेषासंभवादनुष्ठेया एव, तदसंभवश्च तत्कार्यार्थत्वात्तेषाम् । विद्याख्यकार्यायैव हि विदुषोऽग्निहोत्राद्यनुष्ठानम् कथमिदमवगम्यते ? तद्दर्शनात् । दृश्यते हि

'तमेतं वेदानुवचनेन ब्राह्मणा विविदिषन्ति यज्ञेन दानेन तपसानाशकेन'

(बृ. ४।४।२२)

इत्यादिनाग्निहोत्रादीनां विद्यासाधनत्वम् । विद्यायाश्च आ प्रयाणादभ्यासाधेयातिशयाया

Not again is there any means of proof, for the impressions being the cause of the maintenance of the body apart from the gratification and non-gratification of the Lord, produced (respectively) by meritorious and non-meritorious deeds. || 15 ||

Here ends the Anārabdhakāryādhikaraṇa (9)

But Agnihotra etc., for the sake of producing that itself, on account of that being seen || 16 ||

(Adhikaraṇa 10, Sūtras 16–18)

[510] In (the Sūtra)

'Thus non-contact of the other also' (Bra. Sū. IV. 1·14)

has been stated non-contact even with a good deed, on account of the power of Vidyā. In the case also of Fire-sacrifice etc., and obligatory and occasional duties of one's own Āśrama, being on par with good deeds, if there is non-contact with their fruit, there would be the non-performance of them against one's will—This (prima facie view) being reached, it is said (in reply)—Agnihotrādi tu — The word Tu distinguishes the matter from other good deeds. The Āśrama-duties — Agnihotra and others have indeed to be performed, on account of the impossibility of non-contact with the fruit; and that impossibility is for the sake of the functions performed by them. For, the performance of Agnihotra etc., in the case of the wise one, is for the sake of the effect viz Vidyā itself. How is this known? Taddarśanāt — On account of that being seen; for, it is seen that Agnihotra and others are the means of Vidyā in

'Him, thus one, in accordance with the instruction in the Vedas, Brāhmaṇas desire to know by sacrifice, by gifts, by penance indestructible'

(Br. 4·4·22)

अहरहरुत्पाद्यत्वात्तदुत्पत्त्यर्थमाश्रमकर्माण्यहरहरनुष्ठेयमेव। अन्यथाश्रमकर्मलोपे दूषितान्तः-करणस्य विद्योत्पत्तिरेव न स्यात् ॥ १६ ॥

यद्यग्निहोत्रादिसाधुकृत्या विद्योत्पत्त्यर्थो, विद्योत्पत्तेः प्राचीनं च सुकृतम्

'यावत्संपातमुषित्वा' (छा. ५।१०।५)

'प्राप्यान्तं कर्मणः' (बृ. ४।४।६)

इत्यनुभवेन विनष्टं भुक्तावशिष्टं च प्रारब्धफलम्, सुहृदः साधुकृत्यामित्यस्य को विषयः? तत्राह—

अतोन्यापि ह्येकेषामुभयोः ॥ १७ ॥

अतोऽग्निहोत्रादिसाधुकृत्याया विद्योत्पत्त्यर्थाया अन्यापि विद्याधिगमात्पूर्वोत्तरयोरुभयोरपि पुण्यकर्मणोः प्रबलकर्मप्रतिबद्धफला साधुकृत्याऽनन्ता संभवत्येव, तद्विषयमिदमेकेषां शाखिनां वचनम्—तस्य पुत्रा दायमुपयन्ति सुहृदः साधुकृत्याम्—इति। विद्याश्लेषविनाशश्रुतिश्च तद्विषया ॥ १७ ॥

अनुष्ठितस्यापि कर्मणः फलप्रतिबन्धसंभवं पूर्वोक्तं स्मारयति—

यदेव विद्ययेति हि ॥ १८ ॥

And because Vidyā is to be produced day after day with its content increased through practice up to death, the Aśrama-duties also have got to be performed daily for its production; otherwise, on the cessation of the Āśrama-Karmans, there would be no production itself of Vidyā in the case of one of an impure mind. ॥ 16 ॥

If the good deeds like Agnihotra etc., are for the production of Vidyā, and if the good deed prior to the production of the Vidyā perishes by being experienced as stated in

'Having stayed till the fall (of the body)' (Cha. 5·10·5)

'Having gone to the end of Karman' (Br. 4·4·6)

and the fruit of the Karman that has started functioning, being enjoyed, and has some remainder, — what then is the province of the statement — The friends, the good deeds?

Therefore another also: for, in the case of some, of both. ॥ 17 ॥

Therefore, some other good deed is indeed possible, other than the good deeds Agnihotra etc., that are meant for the production of the Vidyā, endless, having the fruit obstructed by the powerful Karman, in respect of both the good deeds, past as well as future on account of the acquisition of the Vidyā. Referring to that is this statement accepted by the followers of some recensions—His sons inherit his heritage (his) friends (his) good deed — The mention in the Śruti about the non-contact and destruction by Vidyā, refers to that ॥ 17 ॥

(The Sūtrakāra) reminds one of what has been stated before viz. the possibility of the obstacle to the fruit of Karman although gone through —

Whatever by the Vidyā — thus indeed ॥ 18 ॥

'यदेव विद्यया करोति तदेव वीर्यवत्तरम्' (छा. १।१।१०)

इत्युद्गीथविद्यायाः क्रतुफलाप्रतिबन्धफलत्ववचनेनानुष्ठितस्यापि कर्मणः फलप्रतिबन्धः सूच्यते हि। अतो विदुषोऽनुष्ठितप्रतिबद्धफलविषयम्, सुहृदः साधुकृत्याम्, इति शाट्यायनकम् ॥ १८ ॥

अग्निहोत्राद्यधिकरणं समाप्तम् (१०)

भोगेन त्वितरे क्षपयित्वाथ संपद्यते ॥ १९ ॥

(अधिकरण ११, सू. १९)

[511] ययोः पुण्यपापयोः, अश्लेषविनाशावुक्तौ, ताभ्यामितरे, आरब्धकार्ये पुण्यपापे, किं विद्यायोनिशरीरावसाने, उत, तच्छरीरावसाने, शरीरान्तरावसाने वा, इत्यनियमः ? इति संशये

'तस्य तावदेव चिरं यावन्न विमोक्ष्येऽथ संपत्स्ये' (छा. ६।१४।२)

इति तच्छरीरविमोक्षावसानत्वश्रवणात्तदवसाने, इति प्राप्ते, उच्यते—भोगेन तु, इति। तुशब्दः पक्षव्यावृत्त्यर्थः। इतरे, आरब्धकार्ये पुण्यपापे स्वारब्धफलभोगेन क्षपयित्वा तत्फलभोगसमाप्त्यनन्तरं ब्रह्म संपद्यते। ते च पुण्यपापे, एकशरीरोपभोग्यफले चेत्, तच्छरीरावसाने

By the statement about the fruit, non-obstruction of the fruit of the sacrifice in the case of the Udgītha-Vidyā in

'Whatever one does by Vidyā, that alone (is) more powerful' (Chā. 1·1·10)

is indeed suggested obstruction to the fruit of Karman although gone through. Therefore, the statement in the Śāṭyāyana — (His) friends, the good deeds — refers to the fruit obstructed by what is done by the wise one. ॥ 18 ॥

Here ends the Agnihotrādyadhikaraṇa (10)

But by enjoyment having destroyed others, he attains (to Brahman) ॥ 19 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 11, Sūtra 19)

[511] Other than those, — merit and demerit that have started functioning, — merit and demerit, whose non-contact and destruction have been stated — Do these end when the body produced by the Vidyā comes to an end, or do they end with their body, or with another body—is there no rule in this behalf? — this doubt being raised — in

'For him there is delay only so long as he is not freed and becomes merged' (Chā. 6·14·2)

—there being a mention of their end due to the freedom, the freedom from the body—and so, Bhogena tu—The word Tu is for the sake of turning away the (above) view. Itare—Others that have started their function, merit and demerit,—having destroyed them by the enjoyment of the fruit that has started functioning in his case, one attains to Brahman after the completion of the enjoyment of that fruit. And those, merit and demerit, if they produce fruit capable of being enjoyed in one body (only) then at the end of the body (he)

संपद्यते । अनेकशरीरोपभोग्यफले चेत्, तदवसाने संपद्यते, भोगेनैव च क्षपयितव्यत्वादारब्धफलयोः कर्मणोः ।

'तस्य तावदेव चिरं यावन्न विमोक्ष्ये' (छा. ६।१४।२)

इति च भोगेन तयोः कर्मणोर्विमोक्ष उच्यते, देहावधिनियमाश्रवणात् । तदेवं ब्रह्मविद्यायाः प्रागनुष्ठितम्, अभुक्तफलम्, अनारब्धफलं पुण्यपापरूपं कर्मानादिकालसंचितम्, अनन्तं विद्यामाहात्म्याद्विनश्यति । विद्यारम्भोत्तरकालमनुष्ठितं च न श्लिष्यति । तत्र पुण्यरूपं सर्वं विदुषः सुहृदो गृह्णन्ति पापं च द्विषन्त इति निरवद्यम् ॥ १९ ॥

इतरक्षपणाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (११)

इति श्रीभगवद्रामानुजविरचिते शारीरकमीमांसाभाष्ये चतुर्थाध्यायस्य प्रथम पादः ॥

---

attains to (Brahman); if they produce fruit fit to be enjoyed in more than one body, he attains (to Brahman) at the end of that, because both (good and bad) Karmans that have started giving their fruit are fit to be destroyed by enjoyment alone. In

'For him there is delay only so long as he is not freed' (Chā. 6·14·2)

also, freedom from both those Karmans is spoken of as by enjoyment, as there is no fixed limit mentioned in the Śruti for the end of the body. Therefore, in this way, the Karman of the nature of merit and demerit, which is gone through prior to the Brahmavidyā, whose fruit is not yet enjoyed, which has not yet started giving its fruit, which is heaped up from times immemorial, and endless, perishes on account of the greatness of Vidyā. And (the Karman) performed in times posterior to the production of Vidyā does not stick on. There, the friends of the wise one take everything that is meritorious, and the haters the sin — this (is) flawless ॥ 39 ॥

Here ends the Itaraksapaṇādhikaraṇa (11)

Here ends the First Quarter of the Fourth Chapter in the commentary on Śārīrakamīmāṁsā, composed by the Illustrious Revered Rāmānuja.

चतुर्थाध्यायस्य द्वितीयः पादः ।

वाङ्मनसि दर्शनाच्छब्दाच्च ॥ १ ॥

(अधिकरण १, सू. १–२)

[512] इदानीं विदुषो गतिप्रकारं चिन्तयितुमारभते । प्रथमं तावदुत्क्रान्तिश्चिन्त्यते — तत्रेदमाम्नायते—

' अस्य सोम्य पुरुषस्य प्रयतो वाङ्मनसि संपद्यते मनः प्राणे प्राणस्तेजसि तेजः परस्यां देवतायाम् ' (छा. ६।८।६)

इति । अत्र, वाङ्मनसि संपद्यत इति वाचो मनसि संपत्तिश्रुतिः किं वाग्वृत्तिमात्रविषया, उत वाग्विषया ? इति विशये, वृत्तिमात्रविषयेति युक्तम् । कुतः ? मनसो वाक्प्रकृतित्वाभावात्तत्र वाक्स्वरूपसंपत्त्यसंभवात् । वागादिवृत्तीनां मनोऽधीनत्वेन वृत्तिसंपत्तिश्रुतिः कथंचिदुपपद्यते, इति । एवं प्राप्ते, अभिधीयते — वाङ्मनसि, इति — वाक्स्वरूपमेव मनसि संपद्यते । कुतः ? तद्दर्शनात् — दृश्यते हि वागिन्द्रिय उपरतेऽपि मनःप्रवृत्तिः । वृत्तिमात्रसंपत्त्यापि तदुपपद्यत इति चेत् — तत्राह — शब्दाच्च, इति ।

SECOND QUARTER OF THE FOURTH CHAPTER

Vāk in the mind, on account of being seen and on account of the (Vedic) word ॥ 1 ॥

(Adhikarana 1, Sūtras 1–2)

[512] Now, (the Śūtrakāra) starts discussing the mode of departure of the wise one. First, for the matter of that, is considered the going out. There this is mentioned in the Śruti —

'Of this Puruṣa, (O) gentle one, while departing, the Vāk (speech) merges into the mind, the mind into Prāṇa, Prāṇa into the Tejas, and the Tejas into the highest Deity.' (Chā. 6·8·6)

Here, the Śruti, Vāṅmanasi sampadyate, mentioning the merging of speech into the mind — Does it refer only to the function of the Vāk or to the Vāk? — this being the doubt, it would be proper that it refers to the function only. Whence? Because the mind is not the material cause of Vāk, it is impossible for the nature of Vāk to merge into it. The Śruti passage referring to the merging of the function can somehow or other be accounted for, because the functions of Vāk and others are dependent upon the mind — This (prima-facie view) being reached, it is stated (in reply) — Vāṅmanasi — The nature alone of Vāk merges into the mind. Whence? Taddarśanāt — on account of that being seen. For, it is seen that there is the functioning of the mind even when the sense-organ of speech has ceased (functioning). If (it be argued) that it can be accounted for even by the merging of only the functioning — there (the Sūtrakāra) says — Śabdācca — for, (the Vedic) expression

'*वाङ्मनसि संपद्यते*' (छा. ६।८।६)
इति वाक्स्वरूपसंपत्तावेव हि शब्दो न वृत्तिमात्रसंपत्तौ। न हि तदानीं वृत्त्युपरमे वागिन्द्रियं प्रमाणान्तरेणोपलभ्यते येन वृत्तिमात्रं संपद्यत इत्युच्येत।

यदुक्तं मनसो वाक्प्रकृतित्वाभावाद्वाचो मनसि संपत्तिर्नोपपद्यत इति, तत्
'*वाङ्मनसि संपद्यते*' (छा. ६।८।६)
इति वचनान्मनसा वाक्संयुज्यते न तु तत्र लीयते, इति परिहर्तव्यम् ॥ १ ॥

अत एव सर्वाण्यनु ॥ २ ॥

यतो वाचो मनसा संयोगमात्रं संपत्तिर्न तु लयः, अत एव वाचमनु सर्वेषामिन्द्रियाणां मनसि संपत्तिश्रुतिरुपपद्यते
'*तस्मादुपशान्ततेजाः पुनर्भवमिन्द्रियैर्मनसि संपद्यमानैः*' (प्र. ३।९)
इति ॥ २ ॥

वागधिकरणं समाप्तम् (१)

तन्मनः प्राण उत्तरात् ॥ ३ ॥

(अधिकरण २, सू. ३)

[513] तत्सर्वेन्द्रियसंयुक्तं मनः प्राणे संपद्यते — प्राणेन संयुज्यते, न मनोवृत्तिमात्रम्। कुतः ? उत्तरात्

'*Vāk merges into the mind*' (Chā. 6·8·6)
refers to the merging of the nature itself of Vāk and not to the merging merely of the functioning. Not, indeed, at that time when the functioning has ceased, is the sense-organ of speech, apprehended by another means of proof, so that it could be said that only the functioning is merged.

As to what has been said — because the mind is not the constituent cause of Vāk, the merging of Vāk into the mind is not reasonable — that is to be refuted thus — on account of the passage
'*Vāk merges into the mind*' (Chā. 6·8·6)
meaning that Vāk is associated with the mind, but not dissolved into it ‖ 1 ‖

For this very reason, all, after (Vāk) ‖ 2 ‖

Because the Sampatti (merging) of Vāk is but merely the connection with the mind, but not its dissolution — for this very reason, the Śruti-passage mentioning merging in the mind of all the sense-organs after the Vāk, becomes reasonable —
'*Therefore, with lustre all laid low, with the sense-organs, merging into the mind — rebirth,*' (Pra. 3·9)
‖ 2 ‖

Here ends the Vāgadhikaraṇa (1)

That mind in the Prāṇa on account of (the) later (passage) ‖ 3 ‖

(Adhikaraṇa 2, Sūtra 3)

[513] That mind connected with all the sense-organs merges into the Prāṇa — becomes connected with the Prāṇa — not merely the functioning of the mind. Whence? Uttarāt — from the next passage

' मनः प्राणे ' (छा. ६।८।६)

इति वाक्यात् । अधिकाशङ्का तु

' अन्नमयं हि सोम्य मनः ' (छा. ६।५।४)

इति वचनान्मनसोऽन्नप्रकृतिकत्वमवगम्यते । अन्नस्य च

' ता अन्नमसृजन्त ' (छा. ६।२।४)

इत्यम्मयत्वं सिद्धम् ।

' आपोमयः प्राणः ' (छा. ६।५।४)

इति चाप्प्रकृतित्वं प्राणस्यावगम्यते । अतः

' मनः प्राणे संपद्यते ' (छा. ६।८।६)

इत्यत्र प्राणशब्देन प्राणप्रकृतिभूता अपो निर्दिश्य तासु मनःसंपत्तिप्रतिपादने परंपरया स्वकारणे लय इति संपत्तिवचनमुपपन्नं भवतीति — परिहारस्तु

' अन्नमयं हि सोम्य मन आपोमयः प्राणः ' (छा. ६।५।४)

इति मनःप्राणयोरन्नेनाद्भिश्चाप्यायनमुच्यते न तत्प्रकृतित्वम्, आहंकारिकत्वान्मनस आकाशविकारत्वाच्च प्राणस्य, प्राणशब्देनापां लक्षणा च स्यादिति ॥ ३ ॥

मनोऽधिकरणं समाप्तम् (२)

'*The mind in the Prāṇa*' (Chā. 6·8·6)

— But a further doubt (arises) on account of the passage

'*Constituted of food, indeed, gentle one, the mind*' (Chā. 6·5·4)

the mind is apprehended to have food as its material cause. And on account of (the passage)

'*Those produced food*' (Chā. 6·2·4)

is established that food is constituted of waters. On account of (the passage)

'*Prāṇa is constituted of waters*' (Chā. 6·5·4)

is also apprehended that Prāṇa has waters as the material cause. Therefore in (the passage) —

'*The mind merges into Prāṇa*' (Chā. 6·8·6)

having referred to the waters which are the constituent cause of Prāṇa, by the word Prāṇa, when the merging of the mind in them is set forth, the expression, merging, becomes appropriate because in that case there would be the merging indirectly in its own cause — And the refutation (of the above) would be — In (the passage)

'*Constituted of food, indeed, gentle one, (is) the mind; constituted of the waters, Prāṇa*' (Chā. 6·5·4)

— the source of the mind and Prāṇa (respectively) is mentioned as the food and waters, not as their being the constituent causes; because the mind is constituted of Ahaṁkāra, and Prāṇa is a modification of Ākāśa, and there would be the metaphorical reference to waters by the word Prāṇa ‖ 3 ‖

Here ends the Manodhikaraṇa (2)

सोऽध्यक्षे तदुपगमादिभ्यः ॥ ४ ॥

(अधिकरण ३, सू. ४)

[514] यथा

' वाङ्मनसि संपद्यते मनः प्राणे ' (छा.६।८।६)

इति वचनानुरोधेन मनःप्राणयोरेव वाङ्मनसयो संपत्तिस्तथा

' प्राणस्तेजसि ' (छा. ६।८।६)

इति वचनात्तेजस्येव प्राणः संपद्यत इति प्राप्ते, उच्यते — सोऽध्यक्षे, इति। स प्राणोऽध्यक्षे करणाधिपे जीवे संपद्यते। कुतः ? तदुपगमादिभ्यः — प्राणस्य जीवोपगमस्तावच्छ्रूयते

' एवमेवेममात्मानमन्तकाले सर्वे प्राणा अभिसमायन्ति ' (बृ. ४।३।३८)

इति। तथा जीवेन सह प्राणस्योत्क्रान्तिः श्रूयते

' तमुत्क्रामन्तं प्राणोऽनूत्क्रामति ' (बृ. ४।४।२)

इति। प्रतिष्ठा च जीवेन सह श्रूयते

' कस्मिन्नुत्क्रान्त उत्क्रान्तो भविष्यामि कस्मिन्वा प्रतिष्ठिते प्रतिष्ठास्यामि ' (प्र. ६।३)

इति। एवं जीवेन संयुज्य तेन सह तेजःसंपत्तिरिह

' प्राणस्तेजसि ' (छा. ६।८।६)

He, in the President (master), on account of his approach (going unto) etc. ॥ 4 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 3, Sūtra 4)

[514] Just as in conformity with the passage

'Vāk merges into the mind, the mind into Prāna' (Chā. 6·8·6)

there is the merging of the mind and Prāna themselves in Vāk and the mind (respectively); similarly on account of the passage

'The Prāna in the Tejas' (Chā. 6·8·6)

Prāṇa is merged into the Tejas itself — This (prima-facie view) being reached, it is said—Sah, adhyakṣe — He, Prāṇa, in the President (master) of the sense-organs, in the, Jīva, is merged. Whence? Tadupagamādibhyaḥ — The going of the Prāṇa unto the Jīva is, for the matter of that, mentioned in the Sruti —

'In this very manner, unto this Ātman, all Prāṇas move at the time of death.' (Br. 4·3·38)

Similarly, is mentioned in the Śruti

'Him departing, Prāṇa departs after' (Br. 4·4·2)

the departure of the Prāṇa along with the Jīva. And in the Sruti is mentioned his (Prāṇa's) stability along with the Jīva in

'On whose going out, shall I be going out? Who being stabilised, shall I be stabilised?' (Pra. 6·3)

—Thus here in

'The Prāṇa in the Tejas' (Chā. 6·8·6)

' मनः प्राणे ' (छा. ६।८।६)

इति वाक्यात् । अधिकाशङ्का तु

' अन्नमयं हि सोम्य मनः ' (छा. ६।५।४

इति वचनान्मनसोऽन्नप्रकृतिकत्वमवगम्यते । अन्नस्य च

' ता अन्नमसृजन्त ' (छा. ६।२।

इत्यम्मयत्वं सिद्धम् ।

' आपोमयः प्राणः ' (छा. ६।

इति चाप्प्रकृतित्वं प्राणस्यावगम्यते । अतः

' मनः प्राणे संपद्यते ' (छा. '

इत्यत्र प्राणशब्देन प्राणप्रकृतिभूता अपो निर्दिश्य तासु मनःसंपत्तिप्रतिपादने परंप लय इति संपत्तिवचनमुपपन्नं भवतीति — परिहारस्तु

' अन्नमयं हि सोम्य मन आपोमयः प्राणः ' (छा

इति मनःप्राणयोरन्नेनाद्भिश्चाप्यायनमुच्यते न तत्प्रकृतित्वम्, आहंकारिकत्वान् विकारत्वाच्च प्राणस्य, प्राणशब्देनापां लक्षणा च स्यादिति ॥ ३ ॥

मनोधिकरणं समाप्तम् (१)

'*The mind in the Prāṇa*' (

— But a further doubt (arises) on account of the passage

'*Constituted of food, indeed, gentle one, the mi*

the mind is apprehended to have food as its material cause. of (the passage)

'*Those produced food*'

is established that food is constituted of waters. On passage)

'*Prāṇa is constituted of waters*'

is also apprehended that Prāna has waters as the materi in (the passage) —

'*The mind merges into Prāṇa*'

having referred to the waters which are the constituer the word Prāṇa, when the merging of the mind in t expression, merging, becomes appropriate because in t the merging indirectly in its own cause — And the re would be — In (the passage)

'*Constituted of food, indeed, gentle*

constituted of the waters, Prāṇa'

— the source of the mind and Prāna (respectively) and waters, not as their being the constituent c constituted of Ahaṁkāra, and Prāna is a modifi would be the metaphorical reference to waters b

Here ends the Manodhika

नैकस्मिन् — एकैकस्य कार्याक्षमत्वात् । दर्शयतो ह्यक्षमत्वं श्रुतिस्मृती —

'अनेन जीवेनात्मनानुप्रविश्य नामरूपे व्याकरवाणि तासां त्रिवृतं त्रिवृतमेकैकां करवाणि ' (छा. ६।३।२-३)

इति नामरूपव्याकरणयोग्यत्वाय त्रिवृत्करणमुपदिश्यते ।

' नानावीर्याः पृथग्भूतास्ततस्ते संहतिं विना ।
नाशक्नुवन्प्रजाः स्रष्टुमसमागम्य कृत्स्नशः ॥
समेत्यान्योन्यसंयोगं परस्परसमाश्रयाः ।
महदाद्या विशेषान्ता ह्यण्डमुत्पादयन्ति ते ॥' (वि. पु. १।२।५१-५२)

इति । अतः

' प्राणस्तेजसि ' (छा. ६।८।६)

इति तेजःशब्देन भूतान्तरसंसृष्टमेव तेजोऽभिधीयते । अतो भूतेष्वेव संपत्तिः ॥ ६ ॥

भूताधिकरणं समाप्तम् (४)

समाना चा सृत्युपक्रमादमृतत्वं चानुपोष्य ॥ ७ ॥

(अधिकरण ५, सूत्राणि ७–१३)

[516] इयमुत्क्रान्तिः किं विद्वदविदुषोः समाना, उताविदुष एव ? इति चिन्ता-

---

Naikasmin — Not in one, because each one of these singly is incompetent to function. Darśayato hi — for, the Śruti and the Smṛti (works) point out to (their) incompetence. In (the passage)

'With this Living Self, having subsequently entered, I would modify name and form; of them, I would make each one, tripartite, tripartite' (Chā 6·3·2–3)

— the threeforld modification is preached for the sake of competence for the modification in name and form. (And) in

'Then they, possessing different powers, remaining separate, could not create people, without uniting together, not coming jointly as a whole.

Having attained to mutual union, resorting to one another, beginning with Mahat and ending with the particular (modification) — they indeed create the Egg' (V. P. 1·2·51–52)

— Therefore by the word Tejas in

'The Prāṇa in the Tejas' (Chā. 6·8·6)

is mentioned Tejas only as being associated with the other elements. Therefore, the merging into the elements alone ॥ 6 ॥

Here ends the Bhūtādhikaraṇa (4)

And common up to the beginning of the going out, and not consuming immortality ॥ 7 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 5, Sūtras 7-13)

[516] Is this going out again, common to (both) the wise and the non-wise, or does it belong to the non-wise alone ? — this being considered, (the prima facie view) — It belongs to the non-wise alone — is reached —

इत्युच्यते। यथा यमुनाया गङ्गया संयुज्य सागरगमनेऽपि यमुना सागरं गच्छतीति वचो न विरुध्यते, तद्वत् ॥ ४ ॥

अध्यक्षाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (३)

भूतेषु तच्छ्रुतेः ॥ ५ ॥

(अधिकरण ४, सू. ५–६)

[515]

' प्राणस्तेजसि '　　(छा. ६।८।६)

इति जीवसंयुक्तस्य प्राणस्य तेजसि संपत्तिरुक्ता। सा संपत्तिः किं तेजोमात्रे, उत संहतेषु सर्वेषु भूतेषु ? इति विशये, तेजोमात्रश्रवणात्तेजसीति प्राप्ते, उच्यते—भूतेषु, इति। भूतेषु संपद्यत इति। कुतः ? तच्छ्रुतेः—

' पृथिवीमय आपोमयस्तेजोमयः '　　(बृ. ४।४।५)

इति जीवस्य संचरतः सर्वभूतमयत्वश्रुतेः ॥ ५ ॥

ननु तेजःप्रभृतिष्वेकैकस्मिन्क्रमेण संपत्तावपि

' पृथिवीमयः '　　(बृ. ४।४।५)

इत्यादिका श्रुतिरुपपद्यते, अत आह—

नैकस्मिन्दर्शयतो हि ॥ ६ ॥

---

is mentioned the merging into the Tejas, along with the Jīva after being connected with him. Just as though the Yamunā goes to the sea, joined up with the Ganges, the statement that the Yamunā goes to the sea is not contradicted, — like that. ॥ 4 ॥

Here ends the Adhyakṣādhikaraṇa (3)

In the elements on account of the Śruti to that effect ॥ 5 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 4, Sūtras 5–6)

[515] In

' The Prāṇa in the Tejas '　　(Chā. 6·8·6)

the merging of the Prāṇa connected with the Jīva, in the Tejas is mentioned.— The doubt being there — Is that merging in merely the Tejas, or in all the elements taken together ? — and (the prima facie view) being reached — In the Tejas, on account of the mention of only the Tejas in the Śruti — It is stated (in reply) — Bhūteṣu — is merged into the elements. Whence ? Tacchruteḥ — on account of the Sruti (passage)

' Constituted of Pṛthivī, constituted of the waters, constituted of Tejas '　　(Bṛ. 4·4·5)

(describing) that the moving Jīva is constituted of all elements ॥ 5 ॥

I say (says the objector) — The Śruti (passage)

' Constituted of Pṛthivī '　　(Bṛ. 4·4·5)

etc., can be properly construed even when (it is taken to mean that there is) the merging of each one of these in Tejas etc., in succession — so (in reply) says (the Sūtrakāra) —

Not in one, for (Śruti and Smṛti) point out ॥ 6 ॥

नैकस्मिन् — एकैकस्य कार्याक्षमत्वात् । दर्शयतो ह्यक्षमत्वं श्रुतिस्मृती —

'अनेन जीवेनात्मनानुप्रविश्य नामरूपे व्याकरवाणि तासां त्रिवृतं त्रिवृतमेकैकां करवाणि' (छा. ६।३।२-३)

इति नामरूपव्याकरणयोग्यत्वाय त्रिवृत्करणमुपदिश्यते ।

'नानावीर्याः पृथग्भूतास्ततस्ते संहतिं विना ।
नाशक्नुवन्प्रजाः स्रष्टुमसमागम्य कृत्स्नशः ॥
समेत्यान्योन्यसंयोगं परस्परसमाश्रयाः ।
महदाद्या विशेषान्ता ह्यण्डमुत्पादयन्ति ते ॥' (वि. पु. १।२।५१-५२)

इति । अतः

'प्राणस्तेजसि' (छा. ६।८।६)

इति तेजःशब्देन भूतान्तरसंसृष्टमेव तेजोऽभिधीयते । अतो भूतेष्वेव संपत्तिः ॥ ६ ॥

भूताधिकरणं समाप्तम् (४)

समाना चा सृत्युपक्रमादमृतत्वं चानुपोष्य ॥ ७ ॥

(अधिकरण ५, सूत्राणि ७—१३)

[516] इयमुत्क्रान्तिः किं विद्वदविदुषोः समाना, उताविदुष एव ? इति चिन्ता-

---

Naikasmin — Not in one, because each one of these singly is incompetent to function. Darśayato hi — for, the Śruti and the Smṛti (works) point out to (their) incompetence. In (the passage)

'With this Living Self, having subsequently entered, I would modify name and form; of them, I would make each one, tripartite, tripartite' (Chā. 6·3·2–3)

— the threefotld modification is preached for the sake of competence for the modification in name and form. (And) in

'Then they, possessing different powers, remaining separate, could not create people, without uniting together, not coming jointly as a whole.

Having attained to mutual union, resorting to one another, beginning with Mahat and ending with the particular (modification) — they indeed create the Egg' (V. P. 1·2·51–52)

— Therefore by the word Tejas in

'The Prāṇa in the Tejas' (Chā. 6·8·6)

is mentioned Tejas only as being associated with the other elements. Therefore, the merging into the elements alone ॥ 6 ॥

Here ends the Bhūtādhikaraṇa (4)

And common up to the beginning of the going out, and not consuming immortality ॥ 7 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 5, Sūtras 7–13)

[516] Is this going out again, common to (both) the wise and the non-wise, or does it belong to the non-wise alone ? — this being considered, (the prima facie view) — It belongs to the non-wise alone — is reached —

यामविदुष एवेति प्राप्तम्। कुतः ? विदुषोऽत्रैवामृतत्ववचनादुत्क्रान्त्यभावात्। विदुषो ह्यत्रैवामृतत्ववचनं श्राव्यते

'यदा सर्वे प्रमुच्यन्ते कामा येऽस्य हृदि श्रिताः।
अथ मर्त्योऽमृतो भवत्यत्र ब्रह्म समश्नुते ॥' (का. ६।१४; बृ. ४।४।७)

इति। एवं प्राप्ते, अभिधीयते — समाना चा सृत्युपक्रमात्, इति। विदुषोऽप्या सृत्युपक्रमादुत्क्रान्तिः समाना। आ सृत्युपक्रमात् — आ गत्युपक्रमान्नाडीप्रवेशात्प्रागित्यर्थः। विदुषोऽपि हि नाडीविशेषेणोत्क्रम्य गतिः श्रूयते —

'शतं चैका च हृदयस्य नाड्यस्तासां मूर्धानमभिनिःसृतैका।
तयोर्ध्वमायन्नमृतत्वमेति विष्वङ्ङन्या उत्क्रमणे भवन्ति ॥'

(का. ६।१६; छा. ८।६।६)

इति। एवं नाडीविशेषेण गतिश्रवणाद्विदुषोऽप्युत्क्रान्तिरवर्जनीया। सा च नाडीप्रवेशात्प्राग्विशेषाश्रवणात्समाना। तत्प्रवेशदशायां च विशेषः श्रूयते

'तेन प्रद्योतेनैष आत्मा निष्क्रामति चक्षुषो वा मूर्ध्नो वान्येभ्यो वा शरीरदेशेभ्यः' (बृ. ४।४।२)

इति,

Whence? Because there is the absence of going out, in the case of the wise one, on account of the statement about immortality here itself (for him). The statement about the immortality of the wise one, is indeed here mentioned in the Śruti,

'When all the desires that are clinging to his heart are let off, then mortal becomes immortal, — here he attains to Brahman'

(Kā. 6·14; Bṛ. 4·4·7)

(This prima facie view) being reached, it is stated (in reply) — Samānā cā sṛtyupakramāt — In the case of the wise one also, the going out is common up to the starting movement. Ā sṛtyupakramāt — up to the starting of the movement, that is to say, prior to the entrance into the Nādīs. For, even in the case of the wise one, the movement by going out by a particular Nādī is mentioned in the Sruti (passage)—

'Hundred and one are the Nādis of the heart, — of these one extends on to the head; going out above by that he goes to immortality; others are for the going out in various ways'

(Kā. 6·16.; Chā. 8·6·6)

— Thus on account of the mention in the Sruti of the movement by a particular Nādī, the going out in the case of the wise one is unavoidable. And that (going out) is common on account of the absence of any specific mention in the Śruti, prior to the entrance into the Nādī. And there is a specific mention in the Sruti, in the state of entrance into it, in

'That being lighted, this Ātman departs, either from the eye, or from the head, or from the other parts of the body'

(Bṛ. 4·4·2)

'*शतं चैका च हृदयस्य*' (का. ६।१६; छा. ८।६।६)

इत्यनया श्रुत्यैकार्थ्यान्मूर्ध्नो निष्क्रमणं विद्वद्विषयमितरत्वविद्वद्विषयम् ।

यदुक्तं विदुषोऽत्रैवामृतत्वं श्राव्यत इति, तत्रोच्यते — अमृतत्वं चानुपोष्य, इति । चशब्दोऽवधारणे । अनुपोष्य शरीरेन्द्रियादिसंबन्धमदग्ध्वैव यदमृतत्वमुत्तरपूर्वाघयोरश्लेषविनाशरूपं प्राप्यते, तदुच्यते

'*यदा सर्वे प्रमुच्यन्ते*' (का. ६।१४ ; बृ. ४।४।७)

इत्यादिकया श्रुत्येत्यर्थः ।

'*अत्र ब्रह्म समश्नुते*'

इति चोपासनवेलायां यो ब्रह्मानुभवस्तद्विषयमित्यभिप्रायः ॥ ७ ॥

तदापीतेः संसारव्यपदेशात् ॥ ८ ॥

[517] अवश्यं च तदमृतत्वमदग्धदेहसंबन्धस्यैवेति विज्ञेयम् । कुतः ? आपीतेः संसारव्यपदेशात् — अपीतिरप्ययो ब्रह्मप्राप्तिः । सा चार्चिरादिमार्गेण देशविशेषं गत्वेति वक्ष्यते । आ तदवस्थाप्राप्तेः संसारो देहसंबन्धलक्षणो हि व्यपदिश्यते

'*तस्य तावदेव चिरं यावन्न विमोक्ष्येऽथ संपत्स्ये*' (छा.६।१४।२)

इति ।

---

on account of this Śruti having the same sense as (that of)

'*And hundred and one of the heart*' (Kā. 6·16; Chā. 8·6·6)

— the going out from the head refers to the wise one, and the other (alternative) refers to the non-wise.

As to what has been said — immortality here itself is spoken of in the case of the wise one, — it is stated — Amṛtatvam cānuposya — The word Ca is for emphasis Anuposya — even without burning the connection with the body, sense-organs etc., what immortality of the nature of the non-contact and destruction of the posterior and prior sins, is secured, that is referred to by Sruti (passages like)

'*When all are let off*' (Kā. 6·14 ; Br. 4·4·7)

etc., — this (is) the sense. And (the passage)

'*Here he attains to Brahman*'

refers to the realisation of Brahman which takes place at the time of the worship — this (is) the idea ‖ 7 ‖

That up to the merging on account of the mention of the Saṁsāra (worldly existence) ‖ 8 ‖

[517] And necessarily it should be known that immortality belongs to one whose connection with the body is not (as yet) burnt away. Whence? Āpiteh saṁsāravyapadeśāt — Apītiḥ — merging, attainment to Brahman. And it would be stated that (Brahmaprāpti) can be had after reaching specific regions by the Arcirādimārga. Ā—Upto the attainment of that state, Saṁsāra having the characteristic of the connection with the body is indeed referred to in

'*For him there is delay only so long as he is not freed; then he gets merged*' (Chā. 6·14·2)

and also in

' अश्व इव रोमाणि विधूय पापं चन्द्र इव राहोर्मुखात्प्रमुच्य धूत्वा शरीरमकृतं कृतात्मा ब्रह्मलोकमभिसंभवामि '　　　　(छा. ८।१३।१)

इति च ॥ ८ ॥

सूक्ष्मं प्रमाणतश्च तथोपलब्धेः ॥ ९ ॥

इतश्च विदुषोऽपि बन्धो नात्र विदग्धः, यतः सूक्ष्मं शरीरमनुवर्तते। कुत इदमवगम्यते? प्रमाणतस्तथोपलब्धेः। उपलभ्यते हि देवयानेन पथा गच्छतो विदुषः

' तं प्रति ब्रूयात् सत्यं ब्रूयात् '　　　　(कौ. १।६)

इति चन्द्रमसा संवादवचनेन शरीरसद्भावः। अतः सूक्ष्मशरीरमनुवर्तते। अतश्च बन्धो न दग्धः ॥ ९ ॥

नोपमर्देनातः ॥ १० ॥

अतः,

' यदा सर्वे प्रमुच्यन्ते कामा येऽस्य हृदि स्थिताः ।
अथ मर्त्योऽमृतो भवत्यत्र ब्रह्म समश्नुते ॥ '　　　　(क. ६।१४, बृ. ४।४।७)

इति वचनं न बन्धोपमर्देनामृतत्वं वदति ॥ १० ॥

अस्यैव चोपपत्तेरूष्मा ॥ ११ ॥

'Shaking off the sin, like a horse the hair (of the mane); getting out, like the Moon from the mouth of Rāhu, shaking off the body, the deed not done, with the Ātman cleansed, I would attain to Brahmaloka'　　　　(Chā. 8 13·1)

॥ 8 ॥

The subtle, on account of the means of proof and that being found thus ॥ 9 ॥

And for this reason the bondage even of the wise one is not here burnt away, because (his) subtle body persists. Whence is this known? Pramānatas-tathopalabdheh — On account of the means of proof and that being found thus — for, it is found in the case of the wise one going by the Devayāna path, in

'One should speak to him, one should speak the truth'　　　　(Kau. 1·6)

there is the existence of the body on account of the statement of the conversation with the Moon. Hence, the subtle body persists and hence, the bondage is not burnt away. ॥ 9 ॥

Therefore, not by the uprooting ॥ 10 ॥

Therefore, the statement in

'When all the desires that are clinging to his heart are let off, then mortal becomes immortal, here he attains to Brahman'　　　　(Kā. 6·14, Br. 4·4·7)

does not speak of immortality by the uprooting of the bondage. ॥ 10 ॥

On account of the appropriateness of this itself, the warmth. ॥ 11 ॥

अस्य सूक्ष्मशरीरस्य क्वचिद्विद्यमानत्वोपपत्तेर्विदुषः प्रक्रान्तमरणस्य मरणात्प्रागूष्मा स्थूले शरीरे क्वाचित्क उपलभ्यते। न च स्थूलस्यैव शरीरस्यायमूष्मा, अन्यत्रानुपलब्धेः। ततश्चोष्मणः क्वचिदुपलब्धिर्विदुषः सूक्ष्मशरीरस्योत्क्रान्तिनिबन्धनेति गम्यते। तस्माद्विदुषोऽप्या सृत्युपक्रमात्समानोत्क्रान्तिरिति सुष्ठूक्तम् ॥ ११ ॥

पुनरपि विदुष उत्क्रान्तिर्न संभवतीत्याशङ्क्य परिह्रियते —

प्रतिषेधादिति चेन्न शारीरात्स्पष्टो ह्येकेषाम् ॥ १२ ॥

[518] यदुक्तं विदुषोऽप्युत्क्रान्तिः समानेति तन्नोपपद्यते, विदुष उत्क्रान्तिप्रतिषेधात्। तथाहि

'स एतास्तेजोमात्राः समभ्याददानो हृदयमेवान्ववक्रामति' (बृ ४।४।१)

इत्युपक्रम्य

'तेन प्रद्योतेनैष आत्मा निष्क्रामति तमुत्क्रामन्तं प्राणोऽनूत्क्रामति'
(बृ. ४।४।२)

इत्यविदुष उत्क्रान्तिप्रकारमभिधाय

'अन्यन्नवतरं कल्याणतरं रूपं कुरुते' (बृ ४।४।४)

On account of this subtle body being appropriately there in some cases, the warmth prior to death, of the wise one on the point of death is found in some cases in the gross body. Not again does this warmth belong to the gross body alone, because it is not found elsewhere. And therefore, it is known that the occasional apprehension of the warmth is dependent upon the departure of the subtle body in the case of the wise one. Therefore, it is well said that in the case of the wise one also, the going out is common up to the beginning of the movement ॥ 11 ॥

Once again having raised the doubt that the going out in the case of the wise one is not possible — that is being refuted —

If it be objected on account of the denial, (the answer is)— No, from the embodied one, in the case of some, clearly stated ॥ 12 ॥

[518] What has been said that the going out is common even in the case of the wise one, — that is not possible, on account of the repudiation of the going out in the case of the wise one. To explain the same —

Having mentioned the mode of the going out in the case of the non-wise, in (the passage) —

'That being lighted up, this Ātman goes out; him departing, the Prāṇa departs after' (Br. 4·4·2)

beginning with

'He having taken unto him these Tejas-portions, proceeds on to the heart itself' (Br. 4·4·1)

and having mentioned his taking to another body in (the passage)

'(He) secures another newer and more auspicious form'
(Br. 4·4·4)

इति देहान्तरपरिग्रहं चाभिधाय

'प्राप्यान्त कर्मणस्तस्य यत्किंचेह करोत्ययम् ।
तस्माल्लोकात्पुनरेत्यस्मै लोकाय कर्मणे ॥
इति नु कामयमान'　　　　　　　　　　(बृ ४।४।६)

इत्यविद्वद्विषयं परिसमाप्य

'अथाकामयमानो योऽकामो निष्काम आप्तकाम आत्मकामो न तस्य प्राणा उत्क्रामन्ति ब्रह्मैव सन्ब्रह्माप्येति'　　　　　　　　　　(बृ ४।४।६)

इति विदुष उत्क्रान्तिः प्रतिषिध्यते । तथा पूर्वत्रार्तभागप्रश्नेऽपि विदुष उत्क्रान्तिप्रतिषेधो दृश्यते ।

'अप पुनर्मृत्युं जयति'　　　　　　　　　　(बृ ३।२।१०)

इति विद्वांसं प्रस्तुत्य

'याज्ञवल्क्येति होवाच यत्राय पुरुषो म्रियत उदस्मात्प्राणाः क्रामन्त्याहो न'
(बृ ३।२।११)

इति पृष्टे

'नेति होवाच याज्ञवल्क्योऽत्रैव समवलीयन्ते स उच्छ्वयत्याध्मातो मृतः शेते'
(बृ ३।२।११)

इति । अतो विद्वानिहैवामृतत्वं प्राप्नोतीति चेत्—तन्न, शारीरात्प्रत्यगात्मनः प्राणानामुत्क्रान्तिर्ह्यत्र प्रतिषिध्यते न शरीरात् ।

— having finished the topic of the non-wise,

'*Having reached the end of that Karman — whatever this one does here — from that world, he again comes to this world for (further) Karman — thus one longing for*'　　(Br 4 4 6)

—in (the passage)

'*Now the one not longing for, — who, desire-less, free from desires, with desires fulfilled, longing for Ātman — his Prāṇas do not go out being Brahman alone, he goes unto Brahman*'　　(Br 4 4 6)

— the going out in the case of the wise one, is denied　Similarly, even in the Ārtabhāga-question before is to be seen the denial of the going out in the case of the wise one — Having referred to the wise one, in (the passage)

'*He again overcomes death*'　　(Br 3 2·10)

'*He said, (O) Yājñavalkya, where this person dies,—do the vital airs go out of him or not?*'　　(Br. 3·2·11)

— when this was asked —

'*No, said Yajñavalkya, here itself are they dissolved, he becomes bloated, puffed up he lies down dead*'　　(Br 3 2·11)

— Therefore, the wise one secures immortality here itself — If it be objected in this way, (the reply is) — No　Here indeed is denied the going out of the vital airs, from the embodied one, the inmost Ātman, not from the body.

'न तस्य प्राणा उत्क्रामन्ति' (बृ ४।४।६)

इत्यत्र तच्छब्देन

'अथाकामयमान.' (बृ ४ ४।६)

इति प्रकृतः शारीर एव परामृश्यते, नाश्रुतं शरीरम् ।

तस्येति षष्ठ्या प्राणानां संबन्धित्वेन शारीरो निर्दिष्टो न तूत्क्रान्त्यपादानत्वेन । उत्क्रान्त्यपादानं तु शरीरमेवेति चेत्—न, अपादानापेक्षायामश्रुताच्छरीरात्संबान्धितया श्रुतस्यात्मन एव संनिहितत्वेनापादानतयापि ग्राह्यत्वात् । किं च प्राणानां जीवसंबन्धितयैव प्रज्ञातानां तत्संबन्धकथने प्रयोजनाभावात्संबन्धमात्रवाचिन्या षष्ठ्यापादानमेव विशेष इति निश्चीयते, यथा नटस्य शृणोतीति । न चात्र विवदितव्यम् । स्पष्टो ह्येकेषां माध्यंदिनानामाम्नाये शारीरो जीव एवापादानमिति

'योऽकामो निष्काम आप्तकाम आत्मकामो न तस्मात्प्राणा उत्क्रामन्ति'
(श ब्रा १४।७।२।८)

इति । शारीरात्प्राणानामुत्क्रान्तिप्रसङ्गाभावात्तन्निषेधो नोपपद्यते, इति चेत्—न ।

'तस्य तावदेव चिरम्' (छा ६।१४।२)

By the word Tat here in

'His vital airs do not go out' (Br. 4 4 6)

the embodied one alone is referred to, who is the matter in hand in

'Now, one who does not long for' (Br 4 4 6)

and not the body not mentioned in the Sruti

If it be objected that the embodied one is referred to as having connection with the vital airs by the genitive Tasya, not as something from which there is the going out, Apādāna for the going out refers to the body alone — (We reply) — No, because when there is the expectancy for the Apādāna, Ātman alone mentioned as being nearer than the body not mentioned in the Sruti, has got to be apprehended even as being the Apādāna And further, the vital airs being too well-known as verily being connected with the Jiva, there is no purpose in mentioning that connection — and so it is ascertained that there is the specific reference to the Apādāna by the genitive denoting only the connection in general, as in — He hears from the actor. And there should be no debate on this point It is clearly stated in the Vedic text of some — the Mādhyandinas — that the embodied Jiva alone is the Apādāna in

'Who, bereft of desires, free from desires, with desires fulfilled, with desire for Ātman — from him depart not the Prānas' (Śa. Brā 14·7·2 8)

If it be argued — there being no possibility of the going out of the vital airs from the embodied one (Jiva), the repudiation of the same is not proper, — (we reply) — No. Because by the mention of the merging into Brahman at the time of separation from the body in the case of the wise one, in

'For him there is delay only so long' (Chā 6 14 2)

इति विदुषः शरीरवियोगकाले ब्रह्मसंपत्तिवचनेन प्राणानामपि तस्मिन्काले शारीराद्विदुषो वियोगः प्रसज्यते । ततश्च देवयानेन पथा ब्रह्मसंपत्तिर्नोपपद्यते, इति न तस्य प्राणा उत्क्रामन्ति, देवयानेन पथा ब्रह्मप्राप्तेः प्राग्जीवाद्विदुषोऽपि प्राणा न विश्लिष्यन्ते, इत्युच्यते।

आर्तभागप्रश्नोऽपि यदा विद्वद्विषयस्तदायमेव परिहारः । स त्वविद्वद्विषयः, तत्र प्रश्नप्रतिवचनयोर्ब्रह्मविद्याप्रसङ्गादर्शनात् । तत्र हि ग्रहातिग्रहरूपेणेन्द्रियेन्द्रियार्थस्वभावोऽपामग्न्यन्नत्वम्, म्रियमाणस्य जीवस्य प्राणापरित्यागः, मृतस्य नामवाच्यकीर्त्यनुवृत्तिः, तस्य च पुण्यपापानुगुणगतिप्राप्तिरित्येतेऽर्थाः प्रश्नपूर्वकं प्रत्युक्ताः । तत्र च

'अप पुनर्मृत्युं जयति' (बृ. ३।२।१०)

इत्यपामन्न्यन्नत्वज्ञानादग्निजय एव मृत्युजय उच्यते। अतो नात्र विदुषः प्रसङ्गः । अविदुषस्तु प्राणानुत्क्रान्तिवचनं स्थूलदेहवत्प्राणा न मुञ्चन्त्यपि तु भूतसूक्ष्मवज्जीवं परिष्वज्य गच्छन्तीति प्रतिपादयतीति निरवद्यम् ॥ १२ ॥

स्मर्यते च ॥ १३ ॥

स्मर्यते च विदुषोऽपि मूर्धन्यनाड्योत्क्रान्तिः ।

---

there would arise the separation from the embodied (Jīva) of the wise one, even in the case of the Prāṇas at that time. And thence there would not be the merging into Brahman by taking to the Devayāna path; so by — His vital airs depart not — is stated that prior to the attainment to Brahman by the Devayāna path, the Prāṇas are not separated in the case of the wise one.

As to the Ārtabhāga-question also, if it pertains to the wise one this same is the refutation ; but that refers to the non-wise. For, there in the question and the answer is not seen any reference to the contingency of Brahmavidyā. For, there are answered, preceded by queries, these following topics— the nature of the sense-organs and the objects of the senses, having the form of Graha and Atigraha, the waters being the food of fire, the non-abandonment of the Prāṇas by the dying Jīva, the persisting of fame denoted by (the word) Nāma in the case of the dead one, and the attainment of the course in conformity with merit and demerit. There in

'He again conquers death' (Br. 3·2·10)

it has been stated that victory over fire itself is victory over death, owing to the knowledge of waters being the food of Agni. So, here is no reference to the wise one. In the case of the non-wise, however, the statement about the Prāṇas not going out, propounds that the vital airs do not leave like the gross body, but on the other hand, go away clinging to the Jiva like the subtle elements and so, it is unobjectionable. || 12 ||

And it is stated in the Smṛtis || 13 ||

And it is mentioned in the Smṛtis that there is the going out by the Nāḍi in the head, in the case of the wise one —

'ऊर्ध्वमेकः स्थितस्तेषां यो भित्त्वा सूर्यमण्डलम् ।
ब्रह्मलोकमतिक्रम्य तेन याति परां गतिम् ॥' (याज्ञ. स्मृ. ३।१६७)

इति ॥ १३ ॥

आसृत्युपक्रमाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (५)

तानि परे तथा ह्याह ॥ १४ ॥

(अधिकरण ६, सू. १४)

[519] सकरणग्रामः सप्राणः करणाध्यक्षः प्रत्यगात्मोत्क्रान्तिवेलायां तेजःप्रभृतिभूतसूक्ष्मेषु संपद्यते, इत्युक्तम् । सैषा संपत्तिर्विदुषो न विद्यते, इत्याशङ्क्य परिहृतम् । तानि पुनर्जीवपरिष्वक्तानि भूतसूक्ष्माणि, किं यथाकर्म यथाविद्यं च स्वकार्याय गच्छन्ति, उत परमात्मनि संपद्यन्ते ? इति विशये, मध्ये परमात्मसंपत्तौ सुखदुःखोपभोगरूपकार्यादर्शनात्तदुपभोगानुगुण्येन यथाकर्म यथाविद्यं च गच्छन्तीति प्राप्ते, उच्यते—तानि परे, इति । तानि परस्मिन्नात्मनि संपद्यन्ते । कुतः ? तथा ह्याह श्रुतिः

'तेजः परस्यां देवतायाम्' (छा. ६।८।६)

इति । यथाह श्रुतिस्तदनुगुणं कार्यं परिकल्प्यमित्यर्थः । सुषुप्तिप्रलययोर्यथा परमात्मसंपत्त्या

'Of them, one stands high up, who penetrating through the orb of the Sun, going beyond the world of Brahmadeva, goes to the Highest Place by it' (Yājña. Smṛ. 3·167)

॥ 13 ॥

Here ends the Āsṛtyupakramādhikaraṇa (5)

Those in the Highest: so, indeed, says (the Śruti) ॥ 14 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 6, Sūtra 14)

[519] It has been stated that the inmost Ātman, at the time of the going out, along with the group of the sense-organs, the Prāṇas, the Master of the sense-organs merges into the subtle elements, Tejas etc. And that this merging does not take place in the case of the wise one,—this has been refuted after having raised a doubt to that effect. (Now) the doubt being there — whether those subtle elements again clinging to the Jīva, do go for their own purpose in conformity with their Karman and their knowledge, or do they merge into the Paramātman—(The prima facie view) being reached viz. — on account of the absence of any effect in the form of enjoyment of happiness and misery in the interval of merging into the Paramātman, they go in conformity with the enjoyment thereof according to their Karman and according to their knowledge — it is stated (in reply) — Tāni pare — Those are merged into the Highest Ātman. Whence ? Tathā hyāha — For to the same effect says the Śruti

'The Tejas in the highest Deity' (Chā. 6·8·6)

That is to say, — what the Śruti says in conformity with that, that effect has to be postulated. Just as in the case of deep sleep and world-dissolution there

सुखदुःखोपभोगायासविश्रमस्तद्वदिहापि ॥ १४ ॥

परसंपत्त्यधिकरणं समाप्तम् (६)

अविभागो वचनात् ॥ १५ ॥

(अधिकरण ७, सू. १५)

[520] सेयं परमात्मनि संपत्तिः, किं प्राकृतलयवत्कारणापत्तिरूपा, उत वाङ्मनसीत्यादिवदविभागरूपा ? इति चिन्तायां परमात्मनः सर्वेषां योनिभूतत्वात्कारणापत्तिरूपेति प्राप्ते, उच्यते—अविभागः, इति । अपृथग्भावः पृथग्व्यवहारानर्हः संसर्गः, इत्यर्थः । कुतः ? वचनात्—

'तेजः परस्यां देवतायाम्' (छा. ६।८।६)

इत्यत्रापि

'वाङ्मनसि सम्पद्यते' (छा. ६।८।६)

इत्यतः संपद्यते, इति वचनस्यानुषङ्गात् । तस्य च संसर्गविशेषवाचित्वादनुपक्तस्याभिधानवैरूप्ये प्रमाणाभावादुत्क्रान्तिवेलायां कारणापत्तिप्रयोजनाभावात्पुनस्तत्राव्यक्तादिसृष्टयवचनाच्च ॥ १५ ॥

अविभागाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (७)

---

is the cessation of the effort for enjoyment of happiness and misery owing to the merging in the Paramātman; in the same way here also. ॥ 14 ॥

Here ends the Parasampattyadhikarana (6)

Non-distinction on account of the statement ॥ 15 ॥

(Adhikarana 7, Sūtra 15)

[520] This merging into the Paramātman of that kind — Is it of the nature of assuming the state of the cause like the ordinary dissolution, or is it of the form of non-distinction as in the case of the Vāk merging into the mind etc.? — In considering this, there being reached (the prima facie view) — It is of the form of the state of the cause, because the Paramātman is the source of all — it is said (in reply) — Avibhāgah — that is to say, not being distinct, the contact not deserving to be designated as separate. Whence? Vacanāt — because there is its connection with the expression Sampadyate (merges) in

'The Tejas in the highest Deity' (Chā. 6·8·6)

and also here in

'Vāk merges into the mind' (Chā. 6·8·6)

and because there is no logical argument to understand a different denotation of the thing connected, on account of its denotation of a particular contact, and because there is no purpose in assuming the nature of the cause at the time of the going out, and because there is the absence of a statement about the creation of the Unmanifest etc. ॥ 15 ॥

Here ends the Avibhāgādhikarana (7)

तदोकोऽग्रज्वलनं तत्प्रकाशितद्वारो विद्यासामर्थ्याच्चच्छेषगत्यनुस्मृतियोगाच्च हार्दानुगृहीतः शताधिकया ॥ १६ ॥

(अधिकरण ८, सू. १६)

[521] एवं गत्युपक्रमावधि विद्वदविदुषोः समानाकार उत्क्रान्तिप्रकार उक्तः। इदानीं विदुषो विशेष उच्यते। तत्रेदमाम्नायते

'शतं चैका च हृदयस्य नाड्यस्तासां मूर्धानमभिनिःसृतैका।
तयोर्ध्वमायन्नमृतत्वमेति विष्वङ्ङन्या उत्क्रमणे भवन्ति ॥'

(का ६।१६, छा ८।६।६)

इति। अनया नाडीनां शताधिकया मूर्धन्यया नाड्यैव विदुषो गमनमन्याभिरेव चाविदुषो गमनमित्ययं नियम उपपद्यते, न वा, इति संशयः। किं युक्तम्? नियमो नोपपद्यते, इति। कुतः? नाडीनां भूयस्त्वादतिसूक्ष्मत्वाच्च दुर्विवेचनतया पुरुषेणोपादातुमशक्यत्वात्।

'तयोर्ध्वमायन्नमृतत्वमेति विष्वङ्ङन्या उत्क्रमणे भवन्ति'

(का ६।१६, छा ८।६।६)

इति यादृच्छिकीमुत्क्रान्तिमनुवदतीति युक्तमिति। एवं प्राप्ते, प्रचक्ष्महे—

The lighting of the top of the place of that, with the door illumined by that, on account of the power of the Vidyā *and on account of the knowledge and remembrance of what is* subsidiary to that, favoured by one (the highest Purusa) in the heart, by the hundred and one ‖ 16 ‖

(Adhikarana 8, Sūtra 16)

[521] In this manner, has been stated the mode of going out having the same form in the case of the wise and the non-wise up to the beginning of the movement Now is stated the speciality in the case of the wise There it is stated in the Sruti —

'Hundred and one (are) the Nadis of the heart, out of th m one goes on further to the head, going up by it, he goes to immortality, others are (useful) for getting out in various ways'

(Kā 6 16, Chā 8 6 6)

There is a doubt whether the restriction is appropriate or not — there is the going out of the wise one by this Nādi existing in the head alone, the one more than the hundred Nādis, and the going out of the non-wise only by the others — What proper? Restriction is not proper Whence? Because, it is difficult to discriminate in the case of the Nādis as they are many and extremely subtle, so, it is impossible for a person to take to them (The passage)

'Going up by it, he goes to immortality, others are (useful) for getting out in various ways' (Kā 6 16 Chā 8 6 6)

repeats the going out at will, and so it (is) proper — (This prima facie view) being reached, we say (in reply) —

शताधिकया, इति । विद्वाञ्छताधिकया मूर्धन्ययैव नाड्योत्क्रामति । न चास्या विदुषो दुर्विवेचनत्वम् । विद्वान्हि परमपुरुषाराधनभूतात्यर्थप्रियविद्यासामर्थ्यात्, विद्याशेषभूततयात्मनोऽत्यर्थप्रियगत्यनुस्मरणयोगाच्च प्रसन्नेन हार्देन परमपुरुषेणानुगृहीतो भवति ।· ततश्च तदोकस्तस्य जीवस्य स्थानं हृदयमग्रज्वलनं भवति । अग्रे ज्वलनं प्रकाशनं यस्य तदिदमग्रज्वलनम् । परमपुरुषप्रसादात्प्रकाशितद्वारो विद्वांस्तां नाडीं विजानातीति तया विदुषो गतिरुपपद्यते ॥ १६ ॥

तदोकोऽधिकरणं समाप्तम् (८)

रश्म्यनुसारी ॥ १७ ॥

(अधिकरण ९, सू. १७)

[522] विदुषो हृदयाच्छताधिकया मूर्धन्यनाड्या निर्गतस्याप्यादित्यरश्मीननुसृत्य, आदित्यमण्डलगतिः श्रूयते

'अथ यत्रैतदस्माच्छरीरादुत्क्रामत्यथैतैरेव रश्मिभिरूर्ध्वमाक्रमते'

(छा ८।६।५)

इति । तत्र रश्म्यनुसारेणैवेत्ययं गतिनियमः संभवति, न वा, इति चिन्तायां निशि मृतस्य विदुषो रश्म्यनुसारासंभवादनियमः, वचनं तु पक्षप्राप्तविषयमिति प्राप्ते, उच्यते—रश्म्यनुसारी, इति ।

Satādhikayā — The wise one goes out by the head-Nāḍi alone, the one over hundred And for the wise one, there is no question of it being difficult to discriminate For, the wise one, on account of the power of the Vidyā which is exceedingly covetable, which is the worship of the highest Purusa, and on account of his association with the remembrance of the exceedingly covetable course of the Ātman, that is subsidiary to the Vidyā, becomes favoured by the highest Purusa residing in the heart, pleased, and then Tadokas — the place of that Jiva, the heart is Agrajvalana—that in which there is the burning, the lighting up at the top, this is the Agrajvalana Through the favour of the highest Purusa, with the door lighted up, the wise one knows that Nāḍi and so, the movement of the wise one by that is appropriate ॥ 16 ॥

Here ends the Tadokodhikarana (8)

Following the rays ॥ 17 ॥

(Adhikarana 9, Sūtra 17)

[522] In the case of the wise one, although gone out by the head-Nādi, the hundred and one, from the heart, is mentioned in the Sruti, the course to the Sun orb following the rays of the Sun—

'Now where he goes out from this body, then by these very rays he ascends up' (Chā. 8 6·5)

There, while considering whether the rule about this course, viz. only by following the rays, is possible or not—(one view would be) no rule on account of the impossibility of following the rays in the case of the wise one who is dead at night As to the statement (in the Sruti), that refers to what is an alternative at hand, — (This prima facie view) being reached, it is stated (in reply) — Raśmyanusārī — The wise one goes up indeed, following

रश्म्यनुसार्येव विद्वानूर्ध्वं गच्छति। कुतः ?

'अथैतैरेव रश्मिभिः' (छा. ८।६।५)

इत्यवधारणात्। पाक्षिकत्वे ह्येवकारोऽनर्थकः स्यात्।

यदुक्तं निशि मृतस्य रश्म्यसंभवाद्रश्मीननुसृत्य गमनं नोपपद्यते, इति तन्न। निश्यपि सूर्यरश्म्यनुसारः संभवति। लक्ष्यते हि निश्यपि निदाघसमय ऊष्मोपलब्ध्या रश्मिसंभवः। हेमन्तादौ तु हिमाभिभवाद्दुर्दिन इवोष्मानुपलम्भः। श्रूयते च नाडीरश्मीनां सर्वदान्योन्यान्वयः।

'तद्यथा महापथ आतत उभौ ग्रामौ गच्छतीमं चामुं चैवमेवैता आदित्यस्य रश्मय उभौ लोकौ गच्छन्तीमं चामुं चामुष्मादादित्यात्प्रतायन्ते ता आसु नाडीषु सृप्ता आभ्यो नाडीभ्यः प्रतायन्ते तेऽमुष्मिन्नादित्ये सृप्ताः' (छा. ८।६।२)

इति। तस्मान्निश्यपि रश्मिसंभवान्निशि मृतानामपि विदुषां रश्म्यनुसारेण ब्रह्मप्राप्तिरस्त्येव ॥ १७ ॥

रश्म्यनुसाराधिकरणं समाप्तम् (९)

निशि नेति चेन्न संबन्धस्य यावद्देहभावित्वाद्दर्शयति च ॥ १८ ॥

(अधिकरण १०, सू. १८)

---

the rays (of the Sun) alone. Whence? On account of the emphatic statement in

'By these very rays' (Cha. 8·6·5)

If the matter were to admit of any alternative, the use of Eva would be meaningless.

As to what has been stated that in the case of one dead at night, the movement by following the rays (of the Sun) is not possible as the rays are impossible (at that time)—(We reply) Not so. Even at night is possible the movement along with the Sun's rays. For, in the summer season is noticed even at night the existence of the rays by the experience of heat. In winter etc., on the other hand, there is the non-experience of heat, as on a rainy day, on account of its being overpowered by snow. And it is mentioned in the Śruti that there is the connection always between the Nāḍīs and the rays—

'It is thus—as a royal road stretched far off, goes to both the villages, this one, and that one; in the same way these Sun's rays go to both the worlds, this one and that one; they spread out from this Sun; they mixed up with these Nāḍis spread out from these Nāḍis; they get mixed up in the yonder Āditya.' (Chā. 8·6·2)

Therefore, because the rays exist even at night, in the case of the wise although dead during the night there does take place the attainment to Brahman by following the rays ॥ 17 ॥

Here ends the Raśmyanusārādhikaraṇa (9)

If it be objected—Not during night, (the reply is)—No, because the connection persists as long as the body; and the Śruti points out (the same) ॥ 18 ॥

(Adhikarana 10, Sūtra 18)

[523] इदमिदानीं चिन्त्यते—विदुषो निशि मृतस्य ब्रह्मप्राप्तिरस्ति न वेति । यद्यपि निशायां सूर्यरश्मिसंभवाद्रश्म्यनुसारेण गतिर्निशायामपि संभवति, तथापि निशामरणस्य शास्त्रेषु गर्हितत्वात्परमपुरुषार्थलक्षणा ब्रह्मप्राप्तिर्निशामृतस्य न संभवति । शास्त्रेषु दिवामरणं प्रशस्तं विपरीतं निशामरणम्

'दिवा च शुक्लपक्षश्च उत्तरायणमेव च ।
मुमूर्षतां प्रशस्तानि विपरीतं तु गर्हितम् ॥'

इति । दिवामरणनिशामरणयोः प्रशस्तत्वविपरीतत्वे चोत्तमाधमगतिहेतुत्वेन स्याताम् । अतो निशामरणमधोगतिहेतुत्वान्न ब्रह्मप्राप्तिहेतुरिति चेत्—न, विदुषः कर्मसंबन्धस्य यावद्देहभावित्वात् ।

एतदुक्तं भवति — अनारब्धकार्याणामधोगतिहेतुभूतानां कर्मणां विद्यासंबन्धेनैव विनाशात्, उत्तरेषां चाश्लेषात्प्रारब्धकार्यस्य च चरमदेहावधित्वाद्बन्धहेत्वभावाद्विदुषो निशामृतस्यापि ब्रह्मप्राप्तिः सिद्धैव । दर्शयति च श्रुतिः

'तस्य तावदेव चिरं यावन्न विमोक्ष्येऽथ संपत्स्ये' (छा. ६।१४।२)

---

[523] Now is being considered — Is there the attainment to Brahman in the case of the wise one dead at night or not? Although on account of the existence of the Sun's rays at night, movement by following the rays is possible even at night time, still as dying at night is censured in the Śāstras, the attainment to Brahman, which is of the nature of the highest purpose in life, is not possible in the case of one dead at night. In the Śāstras death by day is acclaimed and death by night, the opposite of that.—

'Day and the Bright-half, and verily, the northern Solstice,—
these are acclaimed for impending death, opposite to this is censured.'

Acclamation and otherwise in the case of death by day and death by night could be there on account of that being the cause of an excellent or a base position. So, because dying by night is the cause of the base state, it is not the cause of attainment to Brahman—If (it is argued) thus — (we say) — No, because the connection with the Karman in the case of the wise one, continues as long as the body is there.

This is what is intended to be said — Because the Karmans which are the cause of a downward course and whose effects have not yet started functioning are destroyed by the connection with Vidyā itself, and because the future ones cannot have any connection with that, and because Karman that has started functioning lasts so long as the last body is there, the attainment to Brahman by the wise one though dead at night is definitely established on account of the absence of the cause for bondage. And the Sruti indicates this—

'For him, there is delay only till he is not freed (from the body), then he gets merged' (Chā. 6·14·2)

इति । दिवा च शुक्लपक्षश्चेत्यादिवचनमविद्वद्विषयम् ॥ १८ ॥

निशाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (१०)

अतश्चायनेऽपि दक्षिणे ॥ १९ ॥

(अधिकरण ११, सू. १९–२०)

[524] निशि मृतस्यापि विदुषो ब्रह्मप्राप्तौ यो हेतुरुक्तस्तत एव हेतोर्दक्षिणेऽप्ययने मृतस्य ब्रह्मप्राप्तिः सिद्धा । अधिकाशङ्का तु

'अथ यो दक्षिणे प्रमीयते पितृणामेव महिमानं गत्वा चन्द्रमसः सायुज्यं गच्छति' (म. ना २५।१)

इति दक्षिणायने मृतस्य चन्द्रप्राप्तिश्रवणाच्चन्द्रमसं प्राप्तानां च तेषाम्

'यदा तत्पर्यवैति' (बृ. ६।२।१६)

'अथैतमेवाध्वानं पुनर्निवर्तन्ते' (छा. ५।१०।५)

इति पुनरावृत्तिश्रवणाद्भीष्मादीनां च ब्रह्मविद्यानिष्ठानामुत्तरायणप्रतीक्षादर्शनाद्दाक्षिणायने मृतस्य ब्रह्मप्राप्तिर्न संभवतीति । परिहारस्तु, अविदुषां पितृयाणेन पथा चन्द्रं प्राप्तानामेव पुनरावृत्तिर्विदुषस्तु चन्द्रं प्राप्तस्यापि

'तस्माद्ब्रह्मणो महिमानमाप्नोति' (म. ना. २४।२; २५।१)

---

and the statement — Day and the Bright fort-night etc., refers to the non-wise ‖ 18 ‖

Here ends the Niśādhikarana (10)

Therefore, even in the **Dakṣiṇāyana** ‖ **19** ‖

(Adhikarana 11, Sūtras 19-20)

[524] The cause for the attainment to Brahman in the case of the wise one although dead at night, which has been stated — due to that same cause is established the attainment to Brahman, of one who is dead even at the period of the southern Solstice. But there is this additional doubt — Because in

'Who dies during the southern Solstice, having attained to the greatness of the fathers (Manes) becomes identical with the Moon' (Ma Na. 25 1)

it is mentioned by the Sruti that one dying during the Dakṣiṇāyana goes to the Moon and because there is the mention in the Sruti of returning again in the case of those who had gone to the Moon, in

'When that turns away' (Br. 6 2 16)

'Then, they return again by this very path' (Chā. 5 10 5)

and because waiting for the Uttarāyana is seen in the case of Bhīsma and others who were firmly devoted to Brahmavidyā the attainment to Brahman of one dead during the Daksināyana is not possible — And the refutation of that is — There is the returning in the case of the non-wise ones alone who have reached the Moon by the Pitryāna path, but in the case of the wise one, although he has reached the Moon, reaching the Moon by him who has died during the Daksināyana and is desirous of going over to Brahman, is just for the sake of rest, on account of the remaining part of the passage

'He, therefore, attains to greatness of Brahman'. (Ma. Na. 24-2, 25-1)

इति वाक्यशेषात्तस्य दक्षिणायनमृतस्य चन्द्रप्राप्तिर्ब्रह्म प्रपित्सतो विश्रमहेतुमात्रमिति गम्यते। वाक्यशेषाभावेऽपि पूर्वोक्तादेव बन्धहेत्वभावाद्विदुषश्चन्द्रं प्राप्तस्यापि ब्रह्मप्राप्तिरनिवार्या। भीष्मादीनां योगप्रभावात्स्वच्छन्दमरणानां धर्मप्रवर्तनायोत्तरायणप्राशस्त्यप्रदर्शनार्थस्तथा-विधाचारः ॥ १९ ॥

ननु च विदुषो मुमूर्षून्प्रति पुनरावृत्त्यपुनरावृत्तिहेतुत्वेन कालविशेषविधिर्दृश्यते

'यत्र काले त्वनावृत्तिमावृत्तिं चैव योगिनः ।
प्रयाता यान्ति तं कालं वक्ष्यामि भरतर्षभ ॥
अग्निर्ज्योतिरहः शुक्लः षण्मासा उत्तरायणम् ।
तत्र प्रयाता गच्छन्ति ब्रह्म ब्रह्मविदो जनाः ॥
धूमो रात्रिस्तथा कृष्णः षण्मासा दक्षिणायनम् ।
तत्र चान्द्रमसं ज्योतिर्योगी प्राप्य निवर्तते ॥
शुक्लकृष्णे गती ह्येते जगतः शाश्वते मते ।
एकया यात्यनावृत्तिमन्ययावर्तते पुनः ॥'　　　　(गीता ८।२३-२६)

इति। तत्राह—

योगिनः प्रति स्मर्येते स्मार्ते चैते ॥ २० ॥

And even in the absence of the remaining part of the passage, as there is no cause for bondage as already mentioned, attainment to Brahman even in the case of the wise one who has reached the Mocn, is unavoidable. In the case of Bhīṣma and others commanding death at will through the power of Yoga, there is that kind of behaviour for the sake of again promulgating Dharma and for showing the auspicious nature of Uttarāyaṇa ‖ 19 ‖

I say (says the objector)—In respect of the dying wise ones is mentioned a specific period of time as being the cause of again returning and not returning in

'Departed at what time, again, do the Yogins go forth, not to return and also to return, that time shall I declare (to you) (O) Best of the Bharatas.

Fire, Flame, Day, Bright (fortnight), six months (during which is the Sun's) course to the North; departed there, the people who know Brahman go to Brahman

Smoke, Night, likewise Dark (fortnight), six months (during which is the Sun's) course to the South, — the Yogin, having reached there the Moons's light, returns

These (two) — Bright and Dark — are, verily, deemed (to be) eternal courses for the world; by the one (a person) goes not to return, by the other comes back again.'　　(Gītā 8·23·26)

—There (the Sūtrakāra) says—

These mentioned for remembrance for the Yogins, and recognised in the Smṛtis ‖ 20 ‖

नात्र मुमूर्षून्प्रति मरणकालविशेषोपादानं स्मर्यते, अपि तु योगिनो योगनिष्ठान्प्रति स्मार्ते स्मृतिविषयभूते स्मर्तव्ये देवयानपितृयाणाख्ये गती स्मर्येते योगाङ्गतयानुदिनं स्मर्तुम् । तथा ह्युपसंहारः

'नैते सृती पार्थ जानन्योगी मुह्यति कश्चन ।
तस्मात्सर्वेषु कालेषु योगयुक्तो भवार्जुन ॥' (गीता ८।२७)

इति ।

'अग्निर्ज्योतिः' (गीता ८।२४)
'धूमो रात्रिः' (गीता ८।२५)

इति देवयानपितृयाणे प्रत्यभिज्ञायेते । उपक्रमे च

'यत्र काले तु' (गीता ८।२३)

इति कालशब्दः कालाभिमानिदेवतातिवाहिकपरः, अग्न्यादेः कालत्वासंभवात् । अतः

'तेऽर्चिषमभिसंभवन्ति' (बृ. ६।२।१५)

इति विहितदेवयानानुस्मृतिरत्र विद्यानिष्ठान्प्रति विधीयते, न मुमूर्षून्प्रति मरणकालविशेषः ॥ २० ॥

दक्षिणायनाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (११)

इति श्रीभगवद्रामानुजविरचिते शारीरकमीमांसाभाष्ये चतुर्थाध्यायस्य द्वितीयः पादः ॥

Not here is stated in the Smṛti any acceptance of any specific time for death in respect of the dying; but, on the other hand, respecting the Yogins, expert in Yoga. Smārte—treated in the Smṛtis, to be remembered, these courses —the Devayāna and the Pitṛyāṇa in order that they may be remembered every day as a part of the Yoga (practice). To the same effect is the winding up—

'No Yogin is at all bewildered, knowing these (two) paths, (O) Son of Pṛthā Therefore, at all times, be you addicted to Yoga, (O) Arjuna.' (Gītā 8·27)

— By (the expressions in)

'Fire, Flame' (Gītā 8·24)
'Smoke, Night' (Gītā 8·25)

the Devayāna and the Pitṛyāṇa are recognised. And the word Kāla (time) in the introductory passage

'At what time, however' (Gītā 8·23)

refers to the guide, the supervising Deity of time, on account of the impossibility of Agni etc., being time. Therefore, in

'They go to the Arcis'. (Bṛ. 6·2·15)

the remembrance of the prescribed Devayāna is enjoined on those devoted to Vidyā; and no specific time for death in respect of the dying. ॥ 20 ॥

Here ends the Dakṣiṇāyanādhikaraṇa (11)

Here ends the Second Quarter of the Fourth Chapter in the Commentary on the Śārīrakamīmāṁsā composed by the Illustrious Revered Rāmānuja.

चतुर्थाध्याये तृतीयः पादः ।

अर्चिरादिना तत्प्रथितेः ॥ १ ॥

(अधिकरण १, सू. १)

[525] विदुष उत्क्रान्तस्य नाडीविशेषेण हार्दानुग्रहाद्गत्युपक्रम उक्तः । तस्य गच्छतो मार्ग इदानीं निर्णीयते । तत्र श्रुतिषु मार्गप्रकारा बहुविधा आम्नायन्ते । छान्दोग्ये तावत्

'यथा पुष्करपलाश आपो न श्लिष्यन्त एवमेवंविदि पापं कर्म न श्लिष्यते' (छा. ४।१४।३)

इत्युपक्रम्य ब्रह्मविद्यामुपदिश्याम्नायते

'अथ यदु चैवास्मिञ्छव्यं कुर्वन्ति यदि च नार्चिषमेवाभिसम्भवन्त्यर्चिषोऽहरह्न आपूर्यमाणपक्षमापूर्यमाणपक्षाद्यान्षडुदङ्ङेति मासांस्तान्मासेभ्यः संवत्सरं संवत्सरादादित्यमादित्याच्चन्द्रमसं चन्द्रमसो विद्युतं तत्पुरुषोऽमानवः स एनान्ब्रह्म गमयत्येष देवपथो ब्रह्मपथ एतेन प्रतिपद्यमाना इमं मानवमावर्तं नावर्तन्ते नावर्तन्ते' (छा ४।१५।५-६)

इति । तथात्रैवाष्टमे

'अथैतैरेव रश्मिभिरूर्ध्वमाक्रमते' (छा ८।६।५)

Third Quarter of the Fourth Chapter

By the Arcirādi (path) on account of that being well-known ॥ 1 ॥

(Adhikarana 1, Sūtra 1)

[525] In the case of the wise one gone out by a specific Nāḍī, has been mentioned the beginning of the movement through the favour of the one (highest Purusa) in the heart Now is being decided the path by which he goes There various details about the paths are mentioned in the Sruti—in the *Chāndogya*, for the matter of that, beginning with

'As waters stick not to the lotus-leaf, similarly, the sinful deed sticks not to one who knows thus' (Chā 6 14-3)

— after having taught the Brahmavidyā, it is stated

'Now here indeed whether they perform funeral obsequies for him or not, they proceed on to Arcis itself, from Arcis to Day, from Day to the waxing Fortnight, from the waxing Fortnight to the six Months when (the Sun goes) to the north, from the Months to the Year, from the Year to the Sun from the Sun to the Moon from the Moon to the Lightning — then a non-human Person,—he takes those to Brahman—this (is) the path of the Gods, the path of Brahman — those who proceed by this (path) return not to this human whirlpool, return not' (Chā 4 15 5-6)

Likewise, here itself in the eighth Prapāthaka,

'He ascends up by these very rays' (Cha 8 6 5)

इति। कौषीतकिनश्च देवयानमार्गमन्यथाधीयते

'स एतं देवयानं पन्थानमापद्याग्निलोकमागच्छति स वायुलोकं स वरुणलोकं स आदित्यलोकं स इन्द्रलोकं स प्रजापतिलोकं स ब्रह्मलोकम्' (कौ. १।३)

इति। तथा बृहदारण्यके

'य एवमेतद्विदुर्ये चामी अरण्ये श्रद्धां सत्यमुपासते तेऽर्चिषमभिसंभवन्त्यर्चिषोऽहरह्न आपूर्यमाणपक्षमापूर्यमाणपक्षाद्यान्षण्मासानुदङ्ङादित्य एति मासेभ्यो देवलोकं देवलोकादादित्यमादित्याद्वैद्युतं वैद्युतात्पुरुषोऽमानवः स एत्य ब्रह्मलोकान्गमयति' (बृ. ६।२।१५)

इति। तत्रैव पुनरन्यथा

'यदा वै पुरुषोऽस्माल्लोकात्प्रैति स वायुमागच्छति तस्मै स तत्र विजिहीते यथा रथचक्रस्य खं तेन स ऊर्ध्वमाक्रमते स आदित्यमागच्छति तस्मै स तत्र विजिहीते यथा डम्बरस्य खं तेन स ऊर्ध्वमाक्रमते स चन्द्रमसमागच्छति तस्मै स तत्र विजिहीते यथा दुन्दुभेः खम्' (बृ. ५।१०।१)

इत्यादि। तत्र संशयः—किमर्चिरादिरेक एव मार्ग आभिः श्रुतिभिः प्रतिपाद्यत इति तेनैव ब्रह्म गच्छति विद्वान्, उत तस्मादन्येऽन्यत्र मार्गा इति, तैर्वानेन वा, इति, अनियमः ? इति।

— But the Kauṣītakins read the Devayāna path differently —

'He having reached this Devayāna path comes to the Agniloka, he to the Vāyuloka, he to the Varuṇaloka, he to the Ādityaloka, he to the Indraloka, he to the Prajāpatiloka, he to the Brahmaloka' (Kau 1·3)

— Likewise in the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*

'Those who know this thus, and who truly worship Śraddhā in the forest, they proceed on to the Arcis; from Arcis, to Day; from Day to the waxing Fortnight; from the waxing Fortnight to the six Months when the Sun goes northwards; from the Months to Devaloka; from Devaloka to the Sun, from the Sun to Lightning-loka; from Lightning-loka a non-human Person,—he, having come (there) takes (one) to the Brahmalokas' (Br. 6·2·15)

and there itself, in another way —

'When, indeed, a person departs from this world, he comes to Vāyu; there he (Wind) opens out for him, like the hole of a chariot-wheel; by that he ascends up; he comes to the Sun; he opens out there, like the hole of a Ḍambara — by that he ascends up; he comes to the Moon; there he opens out for him, like the hole of a drum' (Br. 5·10·1)

etc. There (arises the) doubt — Is only one path, Arcirādi, propounded by these Śruti passages, so that the wise one goes to Brahman by that alone; or, there are elsewhere paths other than that, so that he goes by them; or by

किं युक्तम् ? अनियम इति । कुतः ? अनेकरूपत्वान्निरपेक्ष्याच्चेति । एवं प्राप्ते, अभिधीयते—

अर्चिरादिना, इति । अर्चिरादिरेक एव मार्गः सर्वत्र प्रतिपाद्यते । अतोऽर्चिरादिनैव गच्छन्ति । कुतः ? तत्प्रथितेः — तस्यैव सर्वत्र प्रथितेः । प्रथितिः — प्रसिद्धिः । तस्यैव सर्वत्र प्रत्यभिज्ञानादित्यर्थः । प्रत्यभिज्ञानात्स एव मार्गः सर्वत्र न्यूनाधिकभावेन प्रतिपाद्यत इति विद्यागुणोपसंहारवदन्यत्रोक्तानामन्यत्रोपसंहारः क्रियते । छान्दोग्ये तावदुपकोसलविद्यायां (छा ४।१५।५-६) पञ्चाग्निविद्यायां (छा. ५।१०।१-२) चैकरूप एवाम्नायते । वाजसनेयके च पञ्चाग्निविद्यायां (बृ ६।२।१५) तथैवार्चिरादिरल्पान्तर आम्नायते । अतस्तत्रापि स एवेति प्रतीयते । अन्यत्रापि सर्वत्राग्न्यादित्यादयः प्रत्यभिज्ञायन्ते ॥ १ ॥

अर्चिराद्यधिकरणं समाप्तम् (१)

वायुमब्दादविशेषविशेषाभ्याम् ॥ २ ॥

(अधिकरण २, सू. २)

[**526**] अर्चिरादिनैव गच्छन्ति विद्वांस इत्युक्तम् । तत्रार्चिरादिके मार्गे छन्दोगा मासादित्ययोरन्तराले संवत्सरमधीयते

' मासेभ्यः संवत्सरं संवत्सरादादित्यम् ' (छा ४।१५।५)

---

this (alone) — and thus there is no rule ? — What proper ? No rule Whence ? Because different forms (of the paths are given), and (because there is) no expectancy (for any particular one) — This (prima facie view) being reached, this is stated (in reply) —

Arcirādinā — Arcirādi is the only one path propounded everywhere Therefore, they go by the Arcirādi alone Whence ? Tatprathiteh — on account of that alone being well-known everywhere Prathitih — being well-known, that is to say, that alone is everywhere recognised On account of the recognition, because that path alone is propounded everywhere with somewhat less or more (details), — like the inclusion of the attributes of Vidyā, the inclusion of the (details) mentioned elsewhere is to be made elsewhere In the *Chāndogya*, for the matter of that, that is mentioned as having an identical form in the Upakosalavidyā (Chā 4 15 5-6) and Pañcāgnividyā section (Chā 5 10 1-2) And in the *Vajasaneyaka* in the Pañcāgnividya section (Br 6 2 15) the same Arcirādi is mentioned with a less number of stages (intervals) Therefore, there also that alone is apprehended Elsewhere also, everywhere the fire, the Sun etc, are recognised ॥ 1 ॥

Here ends the Arcirādyadhikarana (1)

To Vāyu after Year, on account of the general and particular statements ॥ 2 ॥

(Adhikarana 2 Sūtra 2)

[**526**] It has been stated that the wise ones go by the Arcirādi (path) itself There the followers of the *Chāndogya* recension read in the case of the Arcirādi path—Year in between the Months and the Sun —

' From the Months to the Year; from the Year to the Sun '

(Cha 4 15 5)

इति । वाजसनेयिनस्तु तयोरेवान्तराले देवलोकम्

'मासेभ्यो देवलोकं देवलोकादादित्यम्' (बृ. ६।२।१५)

इति । उभयत्रापि मार्गस्यैकत्वादुभाभ्यमयत्रोपसंहार्यौ । तत्र मासादूर्ध्वमभिहितयोः संवत्सरदेवलोकयोः पञ्चम्याभिहितस्य श्रौतक्रमस्य तुल्यत्वेऽपि

'अर्चिषोऽहरह्न आपूर्यमाणपक्षमापूर्यमाणपक्षाद्यान्षडुदङ्ङेति मासांस्तान्'

(छा. ४।१५।५; बृ ६।२।१५)

इत्यधिककालानां न्यूनकालेभ्य उत्तरोत्तरत्वेन निवेशदर्शनात्संवत्सरस्यैव मासानन्तरं बुद्धौ विपरिवृत्तेः, संवत्सर एव मासादूर्ध्वं निवेशयितव्य इति तत ऊर्ध्वं देवलोक इति निश्चीयते। अन्यत्र वाजसनेयिनः

'यदा वै पुरुषोऽस्माल्लोकात्प्रैति स वायुमागच्छति तस्मै स तत्र विजिहीते यथा रथचक्रस्य खं तेन स ऊर्ध्वमाक्रमते स आदित्यमागच्छति'

(बृ. ५।१०।१)

इत्यादित्यात्पूर्वं वायुमधीयते । कौषीतकिनस्तु

'स एतं देवयानं पन्थानमापद्याग्निलोकमागच्छति स वायुलोकम्'

(कौ. १।३)

इत्यग्निलोकशब्दनिर्दिष्टादर्चिषः परं वायुमधीयते । तत्र कौषीतकिनां पाठक्रमेणार्चिषः परत्वेन प्राप्तस्य वायोर्वाजसनेयिनां

The Vājasaneyins, however, (read) Devaloka in between the same two, in

'From the Months to Devāloka, from Devaloka to the Sun'

(Bṛ. 6·2 15)

The path being the same even in both the recensions, both have got to be included in both There, even though the order given in the Śruti denoted by the ablative case in the case of Saṁvatsara and Devaloka mentioned after Māsa — on account of the inclusion of each succeeding the other, of those of a greater period in those of a lesser period as in

'From Arcis to Day; from Day to the waxing Fortnight, from the waxing Fortnight to those six Months when (the Sun) goes northwards' (Chā 4·15·5, Bṛ. 6·2·15)

the Saṁvatsara alone coming up to the mind after Māsa, it is ascertained that Saṁvatsara alone is to be found a place after Māsa, — and so, after that the world of Gods. Elsewhere the Vājasaneyins in

'When indeed, a person departs from this world, he comes to Vāyu, he (Vāyu) opens out for him there, like the hole in the wheel of a chariot, by that he ascends up, he comes to Āditya'

(Bṛ. 5·10·1)

read Vāyu prior to Āditya. The Kauṣītakins, however, read Vāyu after Arcis pointed out by the word Agniloka, in

'He, having reached the Devayāna path, comes to the Agniloka, he to the Vāyuloka'. (Kau 1·3)

—There in the case of Vāyu who has to come after Arcis by virtue of the order of the reading of the Kauṣītakins, his introduction prior to Āditya is ascertained on account of the order given in the Śruti which is more powerful than the reading, pointed out by the word Ūrdhva in

किं युक्तम् ? अनियम इति । कुतः ? अनेकरूपत्वान्निरपेक्ष्याच्चेति । एवं प्राप्ते, अभिधीयते—

अर्चिरादिना, इति । अर्चिरादिरेक एव मार्गः सर्वत्र प्रतिपाद्यते । अतोऽर्चिरादिनैव गच्छन्ति । कुतः ? तत्प्रथितेः — तस्यैव सर्वत्र प्रथितेः । प्रथितिः — प्रसिद्धिः । तस्यैव सर्वत्र प्रत्यभिज्ञानादित्यर्थः । प्रत्यभिज्ञानात्स एव मार्गः सर्वत्र न्यूनाधिकभावेन प्रतिपाद्यत इति विद्यागुणोपसंहारवदन्यत्रोक्तानामन्यत्रोपसंहारः क्रियते । छान्दोग्ये तावदुपकोसलविद्यायां (छा. ४।१५।५-६) पञ्चाग्निविद्यायां (छा. ५।१०।१-२) चैकरूप एवाम्नायते । वाजसनेयके च पञ्चाग्निविद्यायां (बृ. ६।२।१५) तथैवार्चिरादिरल्पान्तर आम्नायते । अतस्तत्रापि स एवेति प्रतीयते । अन्यत्रापि सर्वत्राग्न्यादित्यादयः प्रत्यभिज्ञायन्ते ॥ १ ॥

अर्चिराद्यधिकरणं समाप्तम् (१)

वायुमब्दादविशेषविशेषाभ्याम् ॥ २ ॥

(अधिकरण २, सू. २)

[526] अर्चिरादिनैव गच्छन्ति विद्वांस इत्युक्तम् । तत्रार्चिरादिके मार्गे छन्दोगा मासादित्ययोरन्तराले संवत्सरमधीयते

'मासेभ्यः संवत्सरं संवत्सरादादित्यम्' (छा. ४।१५।५)

---

this (alone) — and thus there is no rule? — What proper? No rule. Whence? Because different forms (of the paths are given), and (because there is) no expectancy (for any particular one). — This (prima facie view) being reached, this is stated (in reply) —

Arcirādinā — Arcirādi is the only one path propounded everywhere. Therefore, they go by the Arcirādi alone. Whence? Tatprathiteh — on account of that alone being well-known everywhere. Prathitih — being well-known, that is to say, that alone is everywhere recognised. On account of the recognition, because that path alone is propounded everywhere with somewhat less or more (details), — like the inclusion of the attributes of Vidyā, the inclusion of the (details) mentioned elsewhere is to be made elsewhere. In the *Chāndogya*, for the matter of that, that is mentioned as having an identical form in the Upakosalavidyā (Chā 4·15·5–6) and Pañcāgnividyā section (Chā. 5·10·1–2). And in the *Vājasaneyaka* in the Pañcāgnividyā section (Br. 6·2·15) the same Arcirādi is mentioned with a less number of stages (intervals). Therefore, there also that alone is apprehended. Elsewhere also, everywhere the fire, the Sun etc., are recognised. ॥ 1 ॥

Here ends the Arcirādyadhikarana (1)

To Vāyu after Year, on account of the general and particular statements ॥ 2 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 2, Sūtra 2)

[526] It has been stated that the wise ones go by the Arcirādi (path) itself. There the followers of the *Chāndogya* recension read in the case of the Arcirādi path—Year in between the Months and the Sun—

'From the Months to the Year, from the Year to the Sun' (Chā. 4·15·5)

तडितोऽधि वरुणः संबन्धात् ॥ ३ ॥

(अधिकरण ३, सू. ३)

[527] कौषीतकिनां

' स एतं देवयानं पन्थानमापद्याग्निलोकमागच्छति स वायुलोकं स वरुण लोकं स आदित्यलोकं स इन्द्रलोकं स प्रजापतिलोकं स ब्रह्मलोकम् '

(कौ. १।३)

इत्यत्राग्निलोकस्यार्चिःपर्यायत्वेन प्राथम्यमविगीतम्, वायोश्च संवत्सरादूर्ध्वं निवेश उक्तः। आदित्यस्याप्यत्र प्राप्तपाठक्रमबाधेन

' देवलोकादादित्यमादित्याच्चन्द्रमसम् ' (बृ. ६।२।१५)

इति वाजसनेयकोक्तश्रुतिक्रमाद्देवलोकशब्दाभिहिताद्वायोरुपरि निवेशः सिद्धः। इदानीं वरुणेन्द्रादिषु चिन्ता प्राप्ता। किमेते वरुणादयो यथापाठं वायोरूर्ध्वं निवेशयितव्याः, आहोस्विद्विद्युतोऽधि ? इति विशये, अर्चिःप्रभृतिषु सर्वेषु

' अर्चिषोऽहः ' (छा. ४।१५।५; ५।१०।१; बृ. ६।२।१५)

इत्यादि श्रुतिक्रमोपरोधाद्विद्युतः परस्ताच्च

Beyond Lightning, Varuṇa on account of connection ॥ 3 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 3, Sūtra 3)

[527] In the case of the Kauṣītakins, in (the passage)

' Having reached this Devayāna path, he comes to Agniloka; he to Vāyuloka; he to Varuṇaloka; he to Ādityaloka; he to Indraloka; he to Prajāpatiloka; he to Brahmaloka ' (Kau 1·3)

Agniloka being a synonym for Arcis, its being the first is not objectionable. And the inclusion of Vāyu after Saṁvatsara has been mentioned. And here in the case of Āditya also, there being a contradiction of the order of recital in

' From the Devaloka to Āditya, from Āditya to the Moon ' (Bṛ. 6·2·15)

the inclusion after Vāyu denoted by the word Devaloka on the strength of the order of recital mentioned by the Śruti of the Vājasaneyakas has been established. Now is coming up the consideration in respect of Varuṇa, Indra etc. — Have these — Varuṇa and others — got to be given a place after Vāyu, in accordance with the recital, or after Lightning ? — This being the doubt — (it may be argued) — On account of the violation of the order in the Śruti viz.

' From Arcis to Day ' (Chā. 4·15·5; 5·10·1; Bṛ. 6·2·15)

(obtaining) in all (passages) beginning with Arcis, and on account of the statement in the Śruti of the Lightning-man taking one to Brahman in (the passage) —

'*तेन स ऊर्ध्वमाक्रमते स आदित्यमागच्छति*'　　　　　(बृ. ५।१०।१)

इत्यूर्ध्वशब्दनिर्दिष्टश्रौतक्रमेण पाठक्रमाद्बलीयसादित्यात्पूर्वं प्रवेशो निश्चीयते। अत आदित्यात्पूर्वं संवत्सरादूर्ध्वं देवलोको वायुश्च प्राप्तौ। तत्रेदं चिन्त्यते—किं देवलोको वायुश्चार्थान्तरभूतौ यथेष्टक्रमेण विद्वानभिगच्छेत्, उतानर्थान्तरत्वेन संवत्सरादूर्ध्वं देवलोकं सन्तं वायुमभिगच्छेत्? इति। किं युक्तम्? भिन्नार्थत्वम्, प्रसिद्धेः। भिन्नार्थत्वे चोर्ध्वशब्देन पञ्चम्या चोभयोः संवत्सरादित्यान्तराले श्रुतिक्रमेण प्राप्तत्वाद्विशेषाभावाच्च यथेष्टमिति प्राप्ते,

उच्यते—वायुमब्दात्, इति। वायुं संवत्सरादूर्ध्वमभिगच्छेत्। कुतः? अविशेषविशेषाभ्यां वायोरेव निर्दिष्टत्वात्। देवलोकशब्दोऽप्यविशेषेण, सामान्येन देवानां लोक इत्यनेन रूपेण वायुमभिधत्ते।

'*स वायुमागच्छति तस्मै स तत्र*'　　　　　(बृ. ५।१०।१)

इति वायुशब्दो विशेषेण वायुमभिधत्ते। अतो देवलोकवायुशब्दाभ्यामविशेषविशेषाभ्यां वायुरेवाभिधीयत इति संवत्सरादूर्ध्वं वायुमेवाभिगच्छेत्। कौषीतकिनां वायुलोकशब्दश्चाग्निलोकशब्दवद्वायुश्चासौ लोकश्चेति व्युत्पत्त्या वायुमेवाभिधत्ते। वायुश्च देवानामावासभूत इत्यन्यत्र श्रूयते—

'*योऽयं पवत एषः देवानां गृहाः*'

इति ॥ २ ॥　　　　　*वाय्वधिकरणं समाप्तम् (२)*

'*By that he ascends up, he comes to Āditya*' (Br. 5·10·1) — Therefore, Devaloka and Vāyu find a place prior to Āditya and after Saṁvatsara.— There this is being considered — Are Devaloka and Vāyu two different entities which a wise one should go to in any order he pleases, or should he go to Vāyu being the Devaloka, after Saṁvatsara, they being not different entities? What proper? They being different entities, on account of these being well-known. And when they are regarded as different entities, on account of the word Ūrdhva and the ablative case, both finding a place in the order of the Śruti in between Saṁvatsara and Āditya, and on account of the absence of any special factor — This (prima facie view) being reached, that (the wise one should go) as he pleases —

— This is stated (in reply) — Vāyumabdāt — One should go to Vāyu after Saṁvatsara Whence? Because Vāyu alone is pointed out Aviśeṣaviśeṣābhyām — both generally and particularly. The word Devaloka also in the form of the world of the Gods denotes Vāyu not particularly, that is, generally. The word Vāyu in

'*He comes to Vāyu; there for him, he*' (Br. 5·10·1) denotes Vāyu specifically. So, because by the words Devaloka and Vāyu — general and particular, Vāyu alone is denoted, so, one should go to Vāyu alone after Saṁvatsara. And in the case of the Kauṣītakins, the word Vāyuloka like the word Agniloka denotes Vāyu himself by virtue of the exposition—Vāyu, that is, the Loka. And elsewhere it is mentioned in the Śruti that Vāyu is the residence of the Gods, —

'*This one who purifies, he is the household of the Gods.*'

॥ 2 ॥

Here ends the Vāyvadhikaraṇa (2)

तडितोऽधि वरुणः संबन्धात् ॥ ३ ॥

(अधिकरण ३, सू ३)

[527] कौषीतकिनां

'स एत देवयानं पन्थानमापद्याग्निलोकमागच्छति स वायुलोकं स वरुणलोकं स आदित्यलोकं स इन्द्रलोकं स प्रजापतिलोकं स ब्रह्मलोकम्'

(कौ १।३)

इत्यत्राग्निलोकस्यार्चिःपर्यायत्वेन प्राथम्यमविगीतम्, वायोश्च संवत्सरादूर्ध्वं निवेश उक्तः। आदित्यस्याप्यत्र प्राप्तपाठक्रमबाधेन

'देवलोकादादित्यमादित्याच्चन्द्रमसम्' (बृ ६।२।१५)

इति वाजसनेयकोक्तश्रुतिक्रमाद्देवलोकशब्दाभिहिताद्वायोरुपरि निवेशः सिद्धः। इदानीं वरुणेन्द्रादिषु चिन्ता प्राप्ता। किमेते वरुणादयो यथापाठं वायोरूर्ध्वं निवेशयितव्याः, आहोस्विद्विद्युतोऽधि ? इति विशये, आर्चिःप्रभृतिषु सर्वेषु

'अर्चिषोऽहः' (छा ४।१५।५ ५।१०।१, बृ ६।२।१५)

इत्यादि श्रुतिक्रमोपरोधाद्विद्युत परस्ताच्च

Beyond Lightning Varuna on account of connection ॥ 3 ॥

(Adhikarana 3 Sūtra 3)

[527] In the case of the Kausitakins in (the passage)

'Having reached this Devayāna path, he comes to Agniloka he to Vāyuloka, he to Varunaloka he to Ādityaloka he to Indraloka he to Prajāpatiloka he to Brahma'oka (Kau 1 3)

Agniloka being a synonym for Arcis, its being the first is not objectionable And the inclusion of Vāyu after Samvatsara has been mentioned And here in the case of Āditya also, there being a contradiction of the order of recital in

'From the Devaloka to Āditya, from Āditya to the Moon' (Br 6 2 15)

the inclusion after Vāyu denoted by the word Devaloka on the strength of the order of recital mentioned by the Sruti of the Vajasaneyakas has been established Now is coming up the consideration in respect of Varuna, Indra etc — Have these — Varuna and others — got to be given a place after Vāyu in accordance with the recital, or after Lightning ? — This being the doubt — (it may be argued) — On account of the violation of the order in the Sruti viz

'From Arcis to Day' (Cha 4 15 5, 5 10 1, Br 6 2 15)

(obtaining) in all (passages) beginning with Arcis, and on account of the statement in the Sruti of the Lightning man taking one to Brahman in (the passage) —

'तत्पुरुषोऽमानव स एनान्ब्रह्म गमयति' (छा ४।१५।५, ५।१०।२)

इति विद्युत्पुरुषस्य ब्रह्मगमयितृत्वश्रवणाच्च सर्वत्रावकाशाभावेनाप्राप्तौ चोपदेशावैयर्थ्यायावश्य कस्यचिद्बाध्यत्वे पाठक्रमानुरोधेन वायोरनन्तरं वरुणो निवेशयितव्यः। वाय्वादित्ययो क्रमस्य बाधितत्वेनेन्द्रप्रजापती अपि इत्रैव निवेशयितव्याविति प्राप्ते, उच्यते—तडितोऽधि वरुण, इति। वरुणस्ताबद्विद्युत उपरिष्टान्निवेशयितव्यः। कुतः? संबन्धात्। मेघो दरवर्तित्वाद्विद्युतो हि वरुणेन संबन्धो लोकवेदयोः प्रसिद्धः।

एतदुक्तं भवति — वरुणादीनामुपदेशावैयर्थ्याय क्वचिन्निवेशयितव्यत्वे सति पाठक्रमादर्थक्रमस्य बलीयस्त्वाद्विद्युतोऽधि वरुणो निवेशयितव्य। ततश्चामानवस्य गमयितृत्वं व्यवधानसहमित्यवगम्यते। तस्य च व्यवधानसहत्वादिन्द्रादेश्चोपदिष्टस्यावश्यं निवेशयितव्यस्य वरुणादुपर्युपदिष्टत्वादागन्तूनामन्ते निवेशयितव्यत्वाच्च वरुणादुपरीन्द्रादिर्निवेशयितव्य इति॥ ३॥

वरुणाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (३)

आतिवाहिकास्तल्लिङ्गात् ॥ ४ ॥

(अधिकरण ४, सू ४–५)

'*That non-human Person, he takes these to Brahman*'
(Ch 4 15 5; 5 10 2)

beyond the Vidyut, there being no room anywhere, no place is there for them (Varuna etc,) in order that the teaching might not be useless, Varuna has got to be given a place after Vāyu in accordance with the order of recital, there being necessarily a contradiction of some one, and because the order of Vāyu and Āditya is also contradicted, Indra and Prajāpati also have got to be given a place here itself — This (prima facie view) being reached, it is stated (in reply)—Taditodhi Varunah — Varuna has got to be given a place beyond (after) Lightning, Whence? Sambandhāt — On account of the connection On account of the Lightning residing in the interior of the clouds its connection with Varuna is indeed well-known in the world and in the Vedas

This is what is intended to be said — When Varuna and others have got to be given a place somewhere in order that the instruction (in the Sruti) should not be useless the order of purport being more powerful than the order of recital, Varuna has got to be given a place after Lightning From that, it is apprehended that the non-human being the leader involves a break, and because that involves a break and as Indra and others mentioned have got to be given a place being mentioned after Varuna and as others not mentioned specifically have got to be given a place at the end, Indra and others have got to be included after Varuna || 3 ||

Here ends the Varunādhikarana (3)

The guides, on account of the characteristics of them || 4 ||

(Adhikarana 4 Sutras 4 5)

[528] इदमिदानीं चिन्त्यते — किमर्चिरादयो मार्गचिह्नभूताः, उत भोगभूमयः, अथ वा विदुषां ब्रह्म प्रेप्सतामतिवोढारः ? इति । किं तावद्युक्तम् ? मार्गचिह्नभूता इति । कुतः ? उपदेशस्य तथाविधत्वात् । दृश्यते हि लोके ग्रामान्प्रति गन्तॄणामेवंविधो दैशिकैरुपदेशः — इतो निष्क्रम्यामुकं वृक्षममुकां नदीममुकं च पर्वतपार्श्वं गत्वामुकं ग्रामं गच्छ — इति । अथवा भोगभूमय एताः स्युः, कालविशेषतया प्रसिद्धानामहरादीनां मार्गचिह्नत्वानुपपत्तेः, अन्यस्य च मार्गचिह्नभूतस्यैतेषामनभिधायित्वात् । भोगभूमित्वं च

'एत एव लोका यदहोरात्राण्यर्धमासा मासा ऋतवः संवत्सराः'

इत्यहरादीनां लोकत्ववचनादुपपद्यते । अत एव च कौषीतकिनः

'अग्निलोकमागच्छति' (कौ. १।३)

इत्यादिना लोकशब्दानुविधानेनार्चिरादीन्पठन्तीति । एवं प्राप्ते, ब्रूमः —

आतिवाहिकाः, इति । विदुषामतिवाहे परमपुरुषेण नियुक्ता आतिवाहिका देवताविशेषा एतेऽर्चिरादयः । कुतः ? तल्लिङ्गात् — अतिवहनलिङ्गात् । अतिवहनं हि गन्तॄणां गमयितृत्वम् । तच्च

'तत्पुरुषोऽमानवः स एनान्ब्रह्म गमयति' (छा. ४।१५।५, ५।१०।२)

---

[528] Now, this is being considered—Are Arcis and others sign-posts on the way, or are they the places of enjoyment, or are they the guides for the wise ones desirous of reaching Brahman? What then proper? Sign-posts on the way. Whence? On account of the instruction being of that nature; for, it is seen in the world, that in the case of travellers to towns, there is this kind of instruction by the instructors — Having gone out of this, going to a particular tree, a particular river, a particular hill-side, go to the particular town. Or, these may be the places of enjoyment, on account of the impropriety of day etc., which are well-known as meaning a particular period of time, being the signposts on the way, and on account of these not denoting any other thing which is a sign-post. And their being the place for enjoyment is appropriate on account of day etc., being mentioned as Lokas in (the passage) —

'*These alone* are *the Lokas what are days and nights, fortnights, months, seasons, years*'.

For this very reason, the Kausītakins read Arcis etc., as connected with the word Loka in (the passage)

'*He comes to Agniloka*' (Kau. 1·3)

etc. This (prima facie view) being reached, we say (in reply) —

Ātivāhikāh — These, Arcis and others, are particular deities, the guides appointed by the highest Purusa for guiding the wise ones. Whence? Tallingāt — on account of the characteristic of guiding; for, Ativahan means making the goers go. And that being mentioned in the Śruti in the concluding portion in

'*That non-human Person, he takes these to Brahman*' (Chā. 4·15·5; 5·10·2)

इत्युपसंहारे श्रूयमाणं पूर्वेषामप्यविशेषश्रुतानां स एव संबन्ध इति गमयति । वदन्ति चार्चिरादयः शब्दा अर्चिराद्यात्मभूताभिमानिदेवताविशेषान्

'तं पृथिव्यब्रवीत्' (तै सं ५।६।२)

इतिवत् ॥ ४ ॥

यद्येवम्

'तत्पुरुषोऽमानवः स एनान्ब्रह्म गमयति' (छा ४।१५।५; ५।१०।२)

इति वैद्युतस्यैव पुरुषस्य ब्रह्म प्रति गमयितृत्वश्रुतेर्विद्युतः परेषां वरुणादीनां कथमातिवाहिकत्वेनान्वयः ? इत्यत आह—

वैद्युतेनैव ततस्तच्छ्रुतेः ॥ ५ ॥

ततो विद्युत उपरि वैद्युतेनामानवेनैवातिवाहिकेन विदुषामाब्रह्मप्राप्ति गमनम् । कुतः ? तच्छ्रुतेः —

'स एनान्ब्रह्म गमयति' (छा. ४।१५।५; ५।१०।२)

इति तस्यैव गमयितृत्वश्रुतेः । वरुणादयस्त्वनुग्राहका इति तेषामप्यातिवाहिकत्वेनान्वयो विद्यत एव ॥ ५ ॥

आतिवाहिकाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (४)

---

points out that the same connection exists in the case of the preceding ones also, mentioned in a general way, by the Śruti. And the words Arcis etc. do denote the particular supervising deities which are the souls (i.e masters) of Arcis and others, like

'The Earth said to him' (Tai. Saṁ. 5 6·2)

॥ 4 ॥

If it is so, because, (in the passage)

'That non-human person, he takes these to Brahman' (Chā. 4·15·5; 5·10·2)

only the man belonging to Lightning is mentioned as the guide towards Brahman, how can there be the connection as guides in the case of Varuna and others that come after Vidyut? — Therefore, says (the Sūtrakāra in reply)

By (the non-human being) belonging to the Lightning, after that, on account of the Śruti to that effect. ॥ 5 ॥

Tatah — After that, after Lightning. Vaidyutena — by the non-human guide himself belonging to Lightning there is the march of the wise upto the acquisition of Brahman. Whence? Tatchrutch — In the Śruti he alone is mentioned as the guide in

'He takes these to Brahman.' (Chā. 4·15·5; 5·10·2)

Because Varuṇa and others do oblige, there does exist their connection also as guides ॥ 5 ॥

Here ends the Ātwāhikādhikarana (4)

कार्यं बादरिरस्य गत्युपपत्तेः ॥ ६ ॥

(अधिकरण ५, सूत्राणि ६–१५)

[529] अर्चिरादिनैव गच्छति विद्वान्, अर्चिरादिरमानवान्तश्च गण आतिवाहिको विद्वांसं ब्रह्म गमयतीत्युक्तम् । इदमिदानीं चिन्त्यते—किमयमर्चिरादिको गणः कार्यं हिरण्यगर्भमुपासीनान्नयति, उत परब्रह्मोपासीनानेव, अथ परब्रह्मोपासीनान्प्रत्यगात्मानं ब्रह्मात्मकतयोपासीनांश्च ? इति विशये कार्यमुपासीनानेव गमयतीति बादरिराचार्यो मन्यते । कुतः ? अस्य हिरण्यगर्भमुपासीनस्यैव, गत्युपपत्तेः । न हि परिपूर्णं सर्वज्ञं सर्वगतं सर्वात्मभूतं परं ब्रह्मोपासीनस्य तत्प्राप्तये देशान्तरगतिरुपपद्यते, प्राप्तत्वादेव । नित्यप्राप्तपरब्रह्मविषयाविद्यानिवृत्तिमात्रमेव हि परविद्याकार्यम् । कार्यं तु हिरण्यगर्भरूपं ब्रह्मोपासीनस्य परिच्छिन्नदेशवर्तिप्राप्यप्राप्त्यर्थं गमनमुपपद्यते । अतोऽर्चिरादिक आतिवाहिकगणस्तमेव नयति ॥ ६ ॥

विशेषितत्वाच्च ॥ ७ ॥

' पुरुषोऽमानवः स एत्य ब्रह्मलोकान्गमयति ' (बृ. ६।२।१५)

To Hiranyagarbha (Kārya) — so Bādari, because the course (to him) of this one is appropriate ‖ 6 ‖

(Adbikarana 5, Sūtras 6–15)

[529] It has been stated that the wise one goes by the Arcirādi path alone, that the host, beginning with Arcis and ending with the non-human being — the guide — takes the wise one to Brahman — Now this is being considered — Does this host beginning with Arcis take the worshippers of the Kārya Hiranyagarbha, or only the worshippers of the Highest Brahman, or the worshippers of the Parabrahman, and the worshippers of the inmost Ātman having Brahman as the Ātman ? — Such a doubt being there, the preceptor Bādari thinks that he leads the worshipper, of the Kārya (Brahman) alone. Whence ? On account of the propriety of going in the case of this one alone, who is the worshipper of Hiranyagarbha. Not, indeed, in the case of the worshipper of the Highest Brahman which is perfect allround, omniscient, all-pervading, the Ātman of all, is appropriate going to another region for attaining to it ; for, that is already attained — For, the purpose of the Highest Vidyā is just the removal alone of Avidyā pertaining to the Highest Brahman which is already always secured. But in the case of one who worships the Kārya, Brahman of the form of Hiranyagarbha, going is justified for the sake of securing something that is to be secured, abiding in a limited region. Therefore, the host of guides beginning with Arcis takes him (to Hiranyagarbha) alone ‖ 6 ‖

And on account of being specified ‖ 7 ‖

In (the passage)

' A non-human person,—he coming, takes (them) to Brahma-lokas ' (Br. 6·2·15)

इति लोकशब्देन बहुवचनेन च लोकविशेषवर्तिनं हिरण्यगर्भमुपासीनमेवामानवो गमयतीति विशेष्यते। किं च

'प्रजापतेः सभां वेश्म प्रपद्ये' (छा. ८।१४।१)

इति कार्यस्य हिरण्यगर्भस्य समीपगमनमर्चिरादिना गतोऽभिसंधत्ते ॥ ७ ॥

नन्वेवम्

'तत्पुरुषोऽमानवः स एनान्ब्रह्म गमयति' (छा. ४।१५।५; ५।१०।२)

इत्ययं निर्देशो नोपपद्यते। हिरण्यगर्भनयने हि स एनान्ब्रह्माणं गमयतीति निर्देष्टव्यं स्यात्। अत आह—

सामीप्यात्तु तद्व्यपदेशः ॥ ८ ॥

'यो ब्रह्माणं विदधाति' (श्वे. ६।१८)

इति हिरण्यगर्भस्य प्रथमजत्वेन ब्रह्मसामीप्यात्तस्य ब्रह्मशब्देन व्यपदेश इति गत्यनुपपत्ति विशेषणादिभिरुक्तैर्हेतुभिर्निश्चीयत इत्यर्थः ॥ ८ ॥

[530] अथ स्यात् — अर्चिरादिना हिरण्यगर्भप्राप्तौ

'एष देवपथो ब्रह्मपथ एतेन प्रतिपद्यमाना इमं मानवमावर्तं नावर्तन्ते'

(छा. ४।१५।६)

---

by the word Loka and the plural number is specified that the non-human being takes only the worshipper of Hiraṇyagarbha for residing in a particular world. Furthermore in

'I reach the palace, the assembly-hall of Prajāpati' (Chā. 8·14·1)

(is stated that) the going near the Kārya Hiraṇyagarbha, one proceeding by the Arcirādi (path) accomplishes ॥ 7 ॥

I say (says the objector), the reference

'That non-human person, he takes these to Brahman' (Chā. 4·15·5 ; 5·10·2)

in that case, would not be appropriate; for, if he is to be taken to Hiraṇyagarbha, it should have been said — he takes these to Brahmadeva — So says (the Sūtrakāra)

But on account of proximity, that reference ॥ 8 ॥

[530] Because Hiraṇyagarbha is the first-born, (as) in

'Who creates Brahmadeva' (Śve. 6·18)

he is near Brahman, so there is the reference to him by the word Brahman,—this is ascertained by the aforesaid logical reasonings qualified by the impossibility of going etc., — this (is) the sense ॥ 8 ॥

Now it may be (objected)—when one has reached Hiranyagarbha by the Arcirādi path, the reference to non-return owing to the acquisition of immortality is inappropriate in (the passages)

'This (is) the path of the Gods, the path of Brahman, those proceeding by this do not revolve about this human whirlpool.' (Chā. 4·15·6)

'तयोर्ध्वमायन्नमृतत्वमेति' (का. ६।१६; छा. ८।६।६)

इत्यमृतत्वप्राप्त्यपुनरावृत्तिव्यपदेशो नोपपद्यते, हिरण्यगर्भस्य कार्यभूतस्य द्विपरार्धकालावसाने विनाशशास्त्रात्।

'आ ब्रह्मभुवनाल्लोकाः पुनरावर्तिनोऽर्जुन' (गीता ८।१६)

इति वचनाद्धिरण्यगर्भं प्राप्तस्य पुनरावृत्तेरवर्जनीयत्वादिति। तत्राह—

कार्यात्यये तदध्यक्षेण सहातः परमभिधानात् ॥ ९ ॥

कार्यस्य ब्रह्मलोकस्यात्यये तदध्यक्षेण हिरण्यगर्भेणाधिकारिकेणावसिताधिकारेण विदुषा सह स्वयमपि तत्राधिगतविद्योऽतः कार्याद्ब्रह्मलोकात्परं ब्रह्म प्राप्नोतीत्यर्चिरादिना गतस्यामृतत्वप्राप्त्यपुनरावृत्त्यभिधानात्

'ते ब्रह्मलोके तु परान्तकाले परामृतात्परिमुच्यन्ति सर्वे' (म. ना. १२।३)

इति वचनाच्चावगम्यते ॥ ९ ॥

स्मृतेश्च ॥ १० ॥

स्मृतेश्चायमर्थोऽवगम्यते

'ब्रह्मणा सह ते सर्वे संप्राप्ते प्रतिसंचरे।
परस्यान्ते कृतात्मानः प्रविशन्ति परं पदम् ॥'
(कूर्म. पू. १२।२६९)

'*Going up by that, he attains to immortality*'
(Kā. 6·16; Chā. 8·6·6)

—because the Śāstra describes the destruction of Hiranyagarbha, the Kārya, at the end of the period of two *Parārdhas*; on account of the statement in

'*The worlds right up to the world of Brahman do revolve again,* (*O*) *Arjuna*' (Gītā 8·16)

returning again in the case of him who has reached Hiranyagarbha is unavoidable—There says (the Sūtrakāra)—

At the destruction of the Kārya (Brahmaloka) along with the presiding officer, beyond that on account of the statement. ‖ 9 ‖

At the destruction of the Kārya, viz. the world of Brahmadeva, Tadadhyaksena — by Hiraṇyagarbha, the officer-in-charge whose office comes to an end, along with the wise one, himself also having secured enlightenment there, secures the Highest Brahman from this Kārya Brahmaloka — this is known from the mention of non-return on securing immortality in the case of one who has gone by the Arcirādi path, and also from the statement in

'*But all of them in the Brahmaloka at the time of the world-dissolution,—they are liberated, having attained, to the Great Immortal* (*Brahman*) (Ma. Nā. 12·3)

‖ 9 ‖

And on account of the Smṛti ‖ 10 ‖

And on account of the Smṛti, this meaning is apprehended—

'*All of them along with Brahman, when dissolution is imminent, with their selves purified, enter the highest place at the end of the high*' (Kūrma. Pū. 12·269)

इति । अतः कार्यमुपासीनमेवार्चिरादिको गणो नयतीति बादरेर्मतम् ॥ १० ॥

[531] अत्र जैमिनिः पक्षान्तरपरिग्रहेण प्रत्यवतिष्ठते ।

परं जैमिनिर्मुख्यत्वात् ॥ ११ ॥

परं ब्रह्मोपासीनानर्चिरादिर्नयतीति जैमिनिराचार्यो मन्यते । कुतः ? मुख्यत्वात् —

'तत्पुरुषोऽमानवः स एनान्ब्रह्म गमयति'　　(छा ४।१५।५; ५।१०।२)

इति ब्रह्मशब्दस्य परस्मिन्नेव ब्रह्मणि मुख्यत्वात् । प्रमाणान्तरेण कार्यत्वनिश्चये सत्येव हि लाक्षणिकत्वं युक्तम् । न च गमनानुपपत्तिः प्रमाणम्, परस्य ब्रह्मणः सर्वगतत्वेऽपि विदुषो विशिष्टदेशगतस्यैवाविद्यानिवृत्तिशास्त्रात् । यथा हि विद्योत्पत्तिर्वर्णाश्रमधर्मशौचाचारदेशकालाद्यपेक्षा

'तमेत वेदानुवचनेन'　　(बृ ४।४।२२)

इत्यादिशास्त्रादवगम्यते, तथा निःशेषाविद्यानिवर्तनरूपविद्यानिष्पत्तिरपि विशिष्टदेशगतिसापेक्षेति गतिशास्त्रादवगम्यते । विदुष उत्क्रान्तिप्रतिषेधादि तु पूर्वमेव परिहृतम् ।

यत्तु

'ब्रह्मलोकान्'　　(बृ ६।२।१५)

इति लोकशब्दबहुवचनाभ्यां विशेषणात्कार्यभूतहिरण्यगर्भप्रतीतिरिति, तदयुक्तम्, निषाद-

---

Therefore, the host Arcirādi etc., leads on the worshipper of the Kārya alone.—This is the view of Bādari. || 10 ||

[531] Here Jaimini stands up, championing another view—

The Highest, (says) Jaimini, on account of that being the primary (sense) || 11 ||

The preceptor Jaimini thinks that Arcirādi takes the worshippers to the Highest Brahman. Whence ? Mukhyatvāt—in (the passage)

'That non-human person, he takes these to Brahman'

(Chā. 4·15·5, 5·10·2)

the word Brahman is used in the primary sense, the Highest Brahman itself, for, only when the nature of the Kārya is ascertained by another means of proof, a metaphorical use would be proper. The impossibility of going, again, cannot be the means of proof. Although the Highest Brahman is all-pervading, the Śāstra speaks of the cessation of Avidyā in the case of the wise one gone to a particular region alone. For, just as the rise of Vidyā standing in need of the duties of the castes and the Āśramas, purity, good conduct place, time, etc., is apprehended from the Śāstra—

'To him, this one, in conformity with the teachings of the Veda'　　(Br. 4·4 22)

—in the same way that the production also of Vidyā of the form of the complete turning away of Avidyā is dependent upon going to a particular region, is apprehended from the Śāstra describing (that) going. The denial of going out etc , in the case of the wise one, has already been refuted.

As to (the contention) again, that on account of being qualified by the word Loka and the plural number thereof, there is the apprehension of Hiranya-

स्थपतिन्यायेन ब्रह्मैव लोको ब्रह्मलोक इति कर्मधारयस्यैव युक्तत्वात् । अर्थस्य चैकत्वे निश्चिते बहुवचनस्य, अदितिः पाशानितिवदुपपत्तेः । परस्य ब्रह्मणः परिपूर्णस्य सर्वगतस्य सत्यसंकल्पस्य स्वेच्छापरिकल्पिताः स्वासाधारणा अप्राकृताश्च लोका नात्यन्ताय न सन्तीति श्रुतिस्मृतीतिहासपुराणप्रामाण्यात् ॥ ११ ॥

दर्शनाच्च ॥ १२ ॥

दर्शयति च श्रुतिर्मूर्धन्यनाड्या निर्गत्य देवयानेन गतस्य परब्रह्मप्राप्तिम्

'एष संप्रसादोऽस्माच्छरीरात्समुत्थाय परं ज्योतिरुपसंपद्य स्वेन रूपेणाभिनिष्पद्यते' (छा. ८।३।४)

इति ॥ १२ ॥

[532] यदुक्तम्

'प्रजापतेः सभां वेश्म प्रपद्ये' (छा. ८।१४।१)

इत्यर्चिरादिना गतस्य कार्ये प्रत्यभिसंधिर्दृश्यत इति, तत्रोत्तरम्—

न च कार्ये प्रत्यभिसंधिः ॥ १३ ॥

न चायं प्रत्यभिसंधिः कार्ये हिरण्यगर्भे, अपि तु परस्मिन्नेव ब्रह्मणि। वाक्यशेषे

---

garbha, the Kārya, —that (is) not proper. Because here it is proper to take the compound only as Karmadhāraya (to be explained) as, Brahmaloka — Brahman itself, the Loka, after the maxim of 'Niṣāda, the chief.' And when the matter is ascertained to be one, the plural number can be accounted for, as being on par with — Aditi, fetters. On account of the authority of Śruti, Smṛti, Itihāsa and Purāna in the case of the Highest Brahman which is all-perfect, all-pervading, with thoughts fulfilled, it is not that the worlds imagined at its will, peculiar to itself, and extraordinary, exist not at all. ॥ 11 ॥

And on account of the Śruti ॥ 12 ॥

And the Śruti refers to the acquisition of the Highest Brahman by one gone by the Devayāna path, having gone out by the head-Nāḍi in (the passage)

'This one, Saṁprasāda, having risen up from this body, having gone unto the highest Jyotis, attains to his own nature' (Chā. 8·3·4)

॥ 12 ॥

[532] As to the statement — in

'I reach the palace, the assembly-hall of Prajāpati' (Chā. 8·14·1)

there is seen the aim towards the Kārya, of one who has gone by the Arcirādi path, there is the answer —

Not, indeed, towards the Kārya, the aim ॥ 13 ॥

Not, indeed, is this aim at the Kārya - Hiranyagarbha, but towards the Highest Brahman alone, because in the remaining passage

' यशोऽहं भवामि ब्राह्मणानाम् ' (छा. ८।१४।१)

इति तस्याभिसंधातुः सर्वाविद्याविमोकपूर्वकसर्वात्मभावाभिसंधानात् ।

' अश्व इव रोमाणि विधूय पापं चन्द्र इव राहोर्मुखात्प्रमुच्य ।
धूत्वा शरीरमकृतं कृतात्मा ब्रह्मलोकमभिसंभवामि ॥ ' (छा. ८।१३।१)

इत्यभिसंभाव्यस्य ब्रह्मलोकस्याकृतत्वश्रवणात्, सर्वबन्धविनिर्मोकस्य च साक्षाच्छ्रवणात् । अतःपरमेव ब्रह्मोपासीनमर्चिरादिरातिवाहिको गणो नयतीति जैमिनेर्मतम् ॥ १३ ॥

[533] इदानीं बादरायणस्तु भगवान्स्वमतेन सिद्धान्तमाह—

अप्रतीकालम्बनान्नयतीति बादरायण उभयथा च दोषात्तत्क्रतुश्च ॥ १४ ॥

अप्रतीकालम्बनान् — प्रतीकालम्बनव्यतिरिक्तान्नयत्यर्चिरादिरातिवाहिको गण इति भगवान्बादरायणो मेने । एतदुक्तं भवति — कार्यमुपासीनान्नयतीति नायं पक्षः संभवति । परमेवोपासीनानित्ययमपि नियमो नास्ति । न च प्रतीकालम्बनानपि नयति, अपि तु ये परं ब्रह्मोपासते, ये चात्मानं प्रकृतिवियुक्तं ब्रह्मात्मकमुपासते तानुभयविधान्नयति । ये तु ब्रह्मकार्यान्तर्भूतं नामादिकं वस्तु देवदत्तादिषु सिंहादिदृष्टिवद्ब्रह्मदृष्ट्या केवलं वा तत्तद्वस्तूपासते न तान्नयति ।

'I am the glory of the Brāhmaṇas' (Chā. 8·14·1)

there is the reference to being the Ātman of all in the case of the meditator, preceded by freedom from all Avidyā, and on account of the Brahmaloka to be reached, being referred to as not being something effected, and on account of the freedom from all bondage being mentioned directly in the Śruti in

'Shaking off sin, like a horse, the (mane-) hair, getting out, like the Moon from the mouth of Rāhu, shaking off the body, not the effect, with the Ātman cleansed, I go unto Brahmaloka' (Chā. 8·13·1)

Thus, the view of Jaimini is that the guide-host, Arcirādi takes along the worshipper to the Highest Brahman itself ‖ 13 ‖

[533] Now again His Holiness Bādarāyaṇa states the conclusion according to his own view —

It takes those not clinging to the symbols — so Bādarāyaṇa, on account of the blemish in both ways, and that aim ‖ 14 ‖

Apratīkālambanān—other than those who cling to the symbols—Nayati, the guide-host Arcirādi takes — so His Holiness Bādarāyaṇa thought. This is what is meant to be said—This view, that (Arcirādi) carries the worshippers to the Kārya, is not possible; neither is there the rule that it carries the worshippers to the Highest alone; nor again does it carry even those clinging to the symbols; but those who worship the Highest Brahman and those who worship the Ātman divested of the Prakṛti having Brahman as the Ātman—it carries those of both kinds. Those again, who worship things like Name etc., that are included in the effects of Brahman by the superimposition of Brahman,

अतः, परं ब्रह्मोपासीनानात्मानं च प्रकृतिवियुक्तं ब्रह्मात्मकमुपासीनान्नयतीति । कुतः ? उभयथा च दोषात् — कार्यमुपासीनान्नयतीति पक्षे

'अस्माच्छरीरात्समुत्थाय परं ज्योतिरुपसंपद्य' (छा. ८।३।४, ८।१२।३)

इत्यादिकाः श्रुतयः प्रकुप्येयुः । परमेवोपासीनानिति च नियमे

'तद्य इत्थं विदुर्ये चेमेऽरण्ये श्रद्धा तप इत्युपासते तेऽर्चिषमभिसंभवन्ति'

(छा. ५।१०।१)

इति पञ्चाग्निविदोऽर्चिरादिगणो नयतीति श्रुतिः प्रकुप्येत् । अत उभयस्मिन्नपि पक्षे दोषः स्यात् । तस्मादुभयविधान्नयतीति ।

तदेतदाह — तत्क्रतुश्च, इति । तत्क्रतुः — तथोपासीनस्तथैव प्राप्नोतीत्यर्थः

'यथाक्रतुरस्मिँल्लोके पुरुषो भवति तथेतः प्रेत्य भवति' (छा. ३।१४।१)

तं यथा यथोपासीत, इति न्यायात्, पञ्चाग्निविदोऽप्यर्चिरादिना गतिश्रवणादर्चिरादिना गतस्य ब्रह्मप्राप्त्यपुनरावृत्तिश्रवणाच्च । अत एव तत्क्रतुन्यायात्प्रकृतिविनिर्मुक्तब्रह्मात्मकात्मानुसंधानं सिद्धम् । नामादिप्राणपर्यन्तप्रतीकालम्बनानां तूभयविधश्रुतिसिद्धोपासना-

---

like the superimposition of the lion etc., upon Devadatta etc., or merely those various entities — it does not take them. Therefore, it takes those who worship the Highest Brahman and worship the Ātman divested of Prakṛti, having Brahman as the Ātman. Whence? Ubhayathā ca doṣāt — there being a blemish in both the cases In the view viz. it takes the worshippers of the Kārya, the Śruti-passages

'Having risen up from this body, having gone unto the highest Jyotis' (Chā. 8·3·4; 8·12·3)

etc., would be (taking offence,) violated. And if there be the rule (it takes) those who worship only the highest Brahman, the Śruti-passage saying that the Arcirādi-host takes the knowers of the Five-fires in

'Then those who thus, and these who worship Sraddhā as Tapas in the forest, they go on to Arcis' (Chā. 5·10·1)

would be violated. Therefore, there would be a blemish in both the views. Therefore, it takes these both kinds of worshippers.

All this (the Sūtrakāra) says by Tatkratuśca — Tatkratuḥ — worshipping in that way, that is to say, he acquires that same, in accordance with the maxim — As in what way one worships, in

'Of what will a person becomes in this world, so he becomes after having departed from here.' (Chā. 3·14·1)

— on account of the mention in the Śruti about the knower of the Five-fires going by the Arcirādi path, and on account of the mention in the Śruti of the acquisition of Brahman and non-return by one gone by the Arcirādi path For this very reason, in accordance with the maxim about one's own will, it is established that there is the meditation on the Atman having Brahman as his Ātman, divested of Prakṛti. In the case of those clinging to the symbols, beginning with Name and ending with Prāṇa, however, there does not exist going by the Arcirādi path, nor the acquisition of Brahman on account of the

भावादचिन्मिश्रोपासने तत्क्रतुन्यायाच्चार्चिरादिना गतिर्ब्रह्मप्राप्तिश्च न विद्यते ॥ १४ ॥

तमिमं विशेषं श्रुतिरेव दर्शयतीत्याह—

विशेषं च दर्शयति ॥ १५ ॥

'यावन्नाम्नो गतं तत्रास्य यथा कामचारो भवति'　　　(छा. ७।१।५)

इत्यादिका श्रुतिर्नामादिप्राणपर्यन्तप्रतीकमुपासीनानां गत्यनपेक्षं परिमितफलविशेषं च दर्शयति । तस्मादचिन्मिश्रं केवलं वा चिद्वस्तु ब्रह्मदृष्ट्या तद्वियोगेन च य उपासते न तान्नयति अपि तु परं ब्रह्मोपासीनानात्मानं च प्रकृतिवियुक्तं ब्रह्मात्मकमुपासीनानातिवाहिको गणो नयतीति सिद्धम् ॥ १५ ॥

कार्याधिकरणं समाप्तम् (५)

इति श्रीभगवद्रामानुजाचार्यविरचिते शारीरकमीमांसाभाष्ये चतुर्थाध्यायस्य तृतीयः पादः ॥

....

---

absence of the two-fold worship established in the Śruti, and on account of the maxim — in accordance with the will — if there is the worship of Cit-mixed ॥ 14 ॥

And this same particular feature, the Sruti itself points out — so says (the Sūtrakāra) —

And (the Śruti) shows the particularity ॥ 15 ॥

And the Śruti-passage

'There as far as the Name goes, there he has movement at will'　　　(Chā. 7·1·5)

etc., points out in the case of the worshippers of symbols, beginning with Name and ending with Prāṇa, a specific limited fruit, no need for a movement. Therefore, those who worship the Acit-mixed or the pure Cit entity by the superimposition of Brahman or without that — it does not take them, but on the other hand, the guide-host takes the worshippers of the Highest Brahman and the worshippers of Ātman divested of Prakṛti, having Brahman as his Atman — this is established ॥ 15 ॥

Here ends the Kāryādhikaraṇa (5)

Here ends the Third Quarter of the Fourth Chapter in the Commentary on the Sārīraka-Mīmāṁsā composed by the Illustrious Revered Rāmānuja.

....

चतुर्थाध्याये चतुर्थः पादः ।

संपद्याविर्भावः स्वेनशब्दात् ॥ १ ॥

(अधिकरण १, सूत्राणि १–३)

[534] परं ब्रह्मोपासीनानामात्मानं च प्रकृतिवियुक्तं ब्रह्मात्मकमुपासीनानामर्चिरादिना मार्गेणापुनरावृत्तिलक्षणा गतिरुक्ता। इदानीं मुक्तानामैश्वर्यप्रकारं चिन्तयितुमारभते —

इदमाम्नायते —

'एवमेवैष संप्रसादोऽस्माच्छरीरात्समुत्थाय परं ज्योतिरुपसंपद्य स्वेन रूपेणाभिनिष्पद्यते' (छा. ८।१२।३)

इति । किमस्माच्छरीरात्समुत्थाय परं ज्योतिरुपसंपन्नस्य देवादिरूपवत्साध्येन रूपेण संबन्धोऽनेन वाक्येन प्रतिपाद्यते, उत स्वाभाविकस्य स्वरूपस्याविर्भावः ? इति संशये, साध्येन रूपेण संबन्ध इति युक्तम्, अन्यथा ह्यपुरुषार्थावबोधित्वं मोक्षशास्त्रस्य स्यात्, स्वरूपस्य स्वतोऽपुरुषार्थत्वदर्शनात् । न हि सुषुप्तौ देहेन्द्रियव्यापारेषूपरतेषु केवलस्यात्मस्वरूपस्य

FOURTH QUARTER OF THE FOURTH CHAPTER

Manifestation on the merging, on account of the word Svena ॥ 1 ॥

(Adhikarana 1, Sūtras 1–3)

[534] In the case of the worshippers of the Highest Brahman and the worshippers of Ātman with Brahman as the Ātman, divested of Prakṛti, going by the Arcirādi path characterised by non-return has been spoken of. Now he (the Sūtrakāra) starts considering the mode of overlordship in the case of the Released souls.

This is what is stated in the Śruti—

'Thus, verily, this Saṁprasāda, having risen up from this body, having gone unto the highest Jyotis, he attains to his own form' (Chā. 8·12·3)

– There being the doubt — Is it propounded by this passage that there is the association of one who has attained to the highest Light on arising from this body,—association with (some) form that is to be obtained, like the form of gods etc., or the manifestation of one's own natural form? — It (is) proper (to hold that there is) the association of a form (yet) to be obtained: otherwise, the Śāstra dealing with salvation would not be enlightening one about the highest purpose in life, on account of one's own nature by itself, not being seen to be the highest purpose in life. Not indeed, in the deep-sleep-state when the operations of the body and the sense-organs cease, is

पुरुषार्थसंबन्धी दृश्यते । न च दुःखनिवृत्तिमात्रं परं ज्योतिरुपसंपन्नस्य पुरुषार्थः, येन स्वरूपाविर्भाव एव मोक्ष इत्युच्येत,

'स एको ब्रह्मण आनन्दः। श्रोत्रियस्य चाकामहतस्य' (तै. २।८)

'रसं ह्येवायं लब्ध्वानन्दी भवति' (तै. २।७)

इत्यादिभ्यो मुक्तस्य सुखानन्त्यश्रवणात्। न चापरिच्छिन्नानन्दरूपचैतन्यमेवास्य स्वरूपम्, तच्च संसारदशायामविद्यातिरोहितं परं ज्योतिरुपसंपन्नस्याविर्भवतीति शक्यं वक्तुम्, ज्ञानस्वरूपस्य तिरोधानासंभवात्। प्रकाशपर्यायस्य ज्ञानस्य तिरोधानं तद्विनाश एवेति हि पूर्वमेवोक्तम्। न च प्रकाशमात्रस्यानन्दता संभवति। सुखस्वरूपता ह्यानन्दस्वरूपता। सुखस्वरूपत्वं चात्मनोऽनुकूलत्वम्। प्रकाशमात्रात्मवादिनः कस्य प्रकाशोऽनुकूलवेदनीयो भवेदिति प्रकाशमात्रात्मवादिनः कथंचिदप्यानन्दस्वरूपता दुरुपपादा। स्वरूपापत्तिमात्रे च साध्ये स्वरूपस्य नित्यनिष्पन्नत्वादुपसंपन्नस्य

'स्वेन रूपेणाभिनिष्पद्यते' (छा. ८।३।४., ८।१२।३)

इति वचनमनर्थकं स्यात्। अतोऽपूर्वेण साध्येन रूपेण संबध्यते। एवं चाभिनिष्पद्यत इति

---

seen the connection of the human purpose in life, of the pure nature of Ātman. Nor again, can mere cessation of misery be the highest purpose in life, for one who has attained to the highest Light, so that it could be said that the manifestation itself of one's form is salvation; because there is the statement in the Śruti about the infinite bliss in the case of the Released one—

'That alone is Brahman's Ānanda (bliss), and of the Brāhmaṇa, well-versed in the Vedas, not affected by longings' (Tai. 2·8)

'For, having secured the Rasa alone, he becomes full of Ānanda' (Tai. 2·7)

etc. Nor again is it possible to say that his own nature is sentiency itself in the form of unlimited Ānanda, and that same veiled by Avidyā in the state of Saṁsāra becomes manifest in one who has attained to the highest Light, on account of the absence of any veiling in the case of one whose nature is knowledge. The veiling of knowledge with light as its synonym, *is nothing* but the destruction of that — this has already been stated. Nor again is it possible for mere Light to have the nature of Ānanda; for, to have the nature of Ānanda is to have the nature of happiness, and to have the nature of happiness is to be agreeable to the Ātman. As for one who holds (the Ātman) to be mere Light, to whom could the light be known as favourable? —(this being the difficulty), in the case of the one who holds that Ātman is mere Light, to have the nature of Ānanda can hardly be reasoned out. If the thing to be secured is merely assuming one's own nature, because one's own nature is always there attained, the statement in the Śruti, about one who has gone unto (the Parajyotis)

'He becomes manifest in his own nature' (Chā 8·3·4; 8·12·3)

would be (sheer) nonsense. Therefore, (the released Soul) is connected with a new form to be secured And in this way, the statement — is manifested

वचनं मुख्यार्थमेव भवति । स्वेन रूपेणेत्यप्यानन्दैकान्तेन स्वासाधारणेनाभिनिष्पद्यत इति संगच्छत इति ।

एवं प्राप्ते, ब्रूमः —संपद्याविर्भावः, इति । अयं प्रत्यगात्मार्चिरादिना परं ज्योतिरुपसंपद्य यं दशाविशेषमापद्यते, स स्वरूपाविर्भावरूपः, नापूर्वाकारोत्पत्तिरूपः । कुतः ? स्वेनशब्दात् — स्वेन रूपेणेति विशेषणोपादानादित्यर्थः । आगन्तुकदेहपरिग्रहे हि स्वेन रूपेणेति विशेषणमनर्थकं स्यात्, अविशेषणेऽपि तस्य स्वकीयरूपत्वासिद्धेः ॥ १ ॥

[535] यत्तूक्तं स्वरूपस्य नित्यप्राप्तत्वादुपसंपद्याभिनिष्पद्यत इति वचनमनर्थकमिति, तत्रोत्तरम् —

मुक्तः प्रतिज्ञानात् ॥ २ ॥

कर्मसंबन्धतत्कृतदेहादिविनिर्मुक्तस्वाभाविकरूपेणावस्थितोऽत्र
'स्वेन रूपेणाभिनिष्पद्यते' (छा. ८।१२।३)
इत्युच्यते । अतो नित्यप्राप्तस्यापि स्वरूपस्य कर्मरूपाविद्यातिरोहितस्य तिरोधाननिवृत्तिरत्राभिनिष्पत्तिरुच्यते । कुतः ? प्रतिज्ञानात् — सा हि प्रतिपाद्यतया प्रतिज्ञाता । कुत इदमवगम्यते ?

— would have only the primary sense. The expression also—in his own nature—does harmonise with — is manifested — on account of the exclusive bliss peculiar to himself.

— This (prima facie view) being reached, we say (in reply) — Sampadyāvirbhāvah — what particular state this inmost Ātman attains to, having gone unto the highest Light by the Arcirādi path, that is of the nature of the manifestation of one's own form, (and) not of the nature of the rise of a new form. Whence? Svenaśabdāt — that is to say, on account of the specific statement viz. — Svena rūpeṇa (in one's own form). If, there is the acceptance of a new body, indeed, the qualifying Svena rūpena would have no significance. And because even if there is no specific attribute, his own *nature is established in him.* ॥ 1 ॥

[535] As to the statement that because one's own nature is always there, the expression—Having gone unto (the Parajyotis), becomes manifest — is meaningless — There (is) the answer —

Free, on account of the solemn declaration ॥ 2 ॥

Here (in the passage)

'He becomes manifest by his own nature' (Chā 8·12·3)

is referred to, one stationed in his own natural form free from association with Karman and the body etc., caused by that. Therefore, the cessation of screening, in the case of one's own nature although always existing (and) concealed by the Avidyā of the form of Karman, is spoken of here as manifestation. Whence? Pratijñānāt — On account of the solemn declaration; for, that is solemnly declared as being propounded. Whence is this known? Because, in order to propound the inmost Ātman, the matter in hand,

'य आत्मा'　　　　　(छा. ८।७।१)

इति प्रकृतं प्रत्यगात्मानं जागराद्यवस्थात्रितयविनिर्मुक्तं प्रियाप्रियहेतुभूतकर्मारब्धशरीरविनिर्मुक्तं च प्रतिपादयितुम्

'एतं त्वेव ते भूयोऽनुव्याख्यास्यामि'　　　　　(छा. ८।९।३)

इति पुनः पुनरुक्त्वा

'एवमेवैष संप्रसादोऽस्माच्छरीरात्समुत्थाय परं ज्योतिरुपसंपद्य स्वेन रूपेणाभिनिष्पद्यते'　　　　　(छा. ८।१२।३)

इत्यभिधानात्। अतः कर्मणा संबद्धस्य परं ज्योतिरुपसंपद्य बन्धनिवृत्तिरूपा विनिर्मुक्तिः स्वेन रूपेणाभिनिष्पत्तिरुच्यते। स्वरूपाविर्भावेऽप्यभिनिष्पत्तिशब्दो दृश्यते, युक्त्यायमर्थो निष्पद्यत इत्यादिषु ॥ २ ॥

[536] यच्चोक्तमात्मस्वरूपस्य सुषुप्तावपुरुषार्थत्वदर्शनात्स्वरूपाविर्भावे मोक्षशास्त्रस्यापुरुषार्थावबोधित्वं स्यादिति कृत्वा देवाद्यवस्थावत्सुखसंबन्ध्यवस्थान्तरप्राप्तिरभिनिष्पत्तिरिति, तत्रोत्तरम् —

आत्मा प्रकरणात् ॥ ३ ॥

'*Who the Ātman*'　　　　　(Chā. 8·7·1)

who is free from the three states, waking etc., and free from the body produced by the Karman which is the cause of the agreeable and the disagreeable — after having again and again stated

'*This one alone, verily, I shall expound again*'
(Chā. 8·9·3)

it is mentioned

'*Thus, verily, this one, the Saṁprasāda having risen up from this body, having gone unto the highest Jyotis, becomes manifest in his own form*'　　　　　(Chā. 8·12·3)

Therefore, freedom of the form of the cessation of bondage, after attaining to the highest Light in the case of one who is tied down by the Karman, is spoken of as manifestation in one's own form. The word Abhinispatti is seen as denoting also the manifestation of one's own form, in expressions like — This sense becomes manifest by logical reasoning. ॥ 2 ॥

[536] As to what again has been said — Because in the deep-sleep-state the nature of Ātman is not known as being the human purpose in life; that the Śāstra dealing with salvation could not be enlightening one about the human purpose in life when one's own nature becomes manifest — considering this, Abhinispatti is the acquisition of another state connected with happiness, like the state of gods etc.;—There (is) the answer—

The Ātman on account of the context ॥ 3 ॥

स्वरूपेणैवायमात्मापहतपाप्मत्वादिसत्यसंकल्पत्वपर्यन्तगुणक इति प्रकरणादवगम्यते,

'य आत्मापहतपाप्मा विजरो विमृत्युर्विशोकोऽविजिघत्सोऽपिपासः सत्यकामः सत्यसंकल्पः' (छा. ८।७।१)

इति प्रजापतिवाक्यप्रक्रमः। इदं च प्रकरणं प्रत्यगात्मविषयमिति

'उत्तराच्चेदाविर्भूतस्वरूपस्तु' (ब्र. सू. १।३।१८)

इत्यत्र प्रतिपादितम्। अतोऽपहतपाप्मत्वादिस्वरूप एवायमात्मा संसारदशायां कर्माख्ययाविद्यया तिरोहितस्वरूपः परं ज्योतिरुपसंपद्याविर्भूतस्वरूपो भवति। अतः प्रत्यगात्मनोऽपहतपाप्मत्वादयः स्वाभाविका गुणाः परं ज्योतिरुपसंपन्नस्याविर्भवन्ति, नोत्पद्यन्ते। यथोक्तं भगवता शौनकेनापि

'यथा न क्रियते ज्योत्स्ना मलप्रक्षालनान्मणेः।
दोषप्रहाणान्न ज्ञानमात्मनः क्रियते तथा॥
यथोदपानकरणात्क्रियते न जलाम्बरम्।
सदेव नीयते व्यक्तिमसतः संभवः कुतः॥
तथा हेयगुणध्वंसादवबोधादयो गुणाः।
प्रकाश्यन्ते न जन्यन्ते नित्या एवात्मनो हि ते॥'

(शौनक-सि. त्र.)

This Ātman in his own nature is known from the context, to be possessed of qualities beginning with, having the sins destroyed and ending with, having the thoughts fulfilled.

'Which Ātman, having the sins destroyed, ageless, deathless, bereft of grief, bereft of hunger, without thirst, having the desires fulfilled, having the thoughts fulfilled' (Chā. 8·7·1)

—this is the introductory part of Prajāpati's speech And that this topic refers to the inmost Ātman has been propounded here (in the Sūtra)—

'If on account of the later state—he has his nature manifested' (Bra. Sū. I. 3·18)

Therefore, this same Ātman, verily, possessed of his own nature as having the sins destroyed etc, with his own nature concealed by Avidyā known as Karman in the state of Samsāra, — having gone unto the highest Light has his own nature made manifest Therefore, the natural qualities, having the sins destroyed etc., become manifest — not produced — in the case of the inmost Ātman who has gone unto the highest Light. As has been said by His Holiness Śaunaka also —

'Just as the lustre is not made (produced) by washing off the dust from the gem, in the same way the knowledge of the Ātman is not made (produced) by the abandonment of blemishes.

Just as the sky in the water is not made by the construction of a well, — what is already existent is made manifest; whence can there be the production of the non-existent?

In the same way, the qualities, enlightenment etc., are brought to light by the destruction of the qualities fit to be abandoned, not produced; for, they are the perpetual ones in the case of the Ātman.' (Śaunaka Si. Tra.)

इति। अतो ज्ञानानन्दादिगुणानां कर्मणात्मनि संकुचितानां परं ज्योतिरुपसंपद्य कर्मरूप बन्धक्षये विकासरूपाविर्भावो नानुपपन्न इति सुष्ठूक्तं संपद्याविर्भाव इति ॥ ३ ॥

संपद्याविर्भावाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (१)

अविभागेन दृष्टत्वात् ॥ ४ ॥

(अधिकरण २, सू. ४)

[537] किमयं परं ज्योतिरुपसंपन्नः सर्वबन्धविनिर्मुक्तः प्रत्यगात्मा स्वात्मानं परमात्मनः पृथग्भूतमनुभवति, उत, तत्प्रकारतया तदविभक्तम् ? इति विशये

'सोऽश्नुते सर्वान्कामान्सह ब्रह्मणा विपश्चिता' (तै. २।१।१)

'यदा पश्यः पश्यते रुक्मवर्णं कर्तारमीशं पुरुषं ब्रह्मयोनिम् ।
तदा विद्वान्पुण्यपापे विधूय निरञ्जनः परमं साम्यमुपैति ॥' (मु. ३।१।३)

'इदं ज्ञानमुपाश्रित्य मम साधर्म्यमागताः ।
सर्गेऽपि नोपजायन्ते प्रलये न व्यथन्ति च ॥' (गीता १४।२)

इत्यादिश्रुतिस्मृतिभ्यो मुक्तस्य परेण साहित्यसाम्यसाधर्म्यावगमात्पृथग्भूतमनुभवतीति प्राप्ते, उच्यते —

Therefore, in the case of the qualities, knowledge, bliss etc, which are contracted in the Ātman due to Karman, the manifestation in the form of expansion, on the destruction of the bondage of the form of Karman, on having attained to the highest Light is not inappropriate — so it has been well said that there is Sampadyāvirbhāvah ॥ 3 ॥

Here ends the Saṁpadyāvirbhāvādhikaraṇa (1)

Not being separate, on account of being seen ॥ 4 ॥

(Adhikarana 2, Sūtra 4)

[537] There being the doubt — This inmost Ātman who has attained to the highest Light, quite free from all bondage,—does he experience himself as being separate from the Paramātman, or as not separate, being his mode ? — From (the passages in) the Śruti and the Smrti

'He enjoys all desires along with the wise Brahman' (Tai. 2·1·1)

'When the seer sees the gold-coloured agent, controller, Purusa with Brahman as the source, then the wise one, having shaken off merit and demerit, free from stain, attains to the maximum resemblance' (Mu. 3·1·3)

'Resorting to this knowledge, attained to the nature of having similar attributes as mine, — they are not born even at the creation, and are not uneasy (pained) at the dissolution either' (Gītā 14·2)

etc.,— (The prima facie view) that he experiences (himself) as separate owing to the apprehension of the Released one as being joined, equal to and possessed of the same qualities as the Highest, — being reached, it is said (in reply) —

अविभागेन, इति। परस्माद्ब्रह्मणः स्वात्मानमविभागेनानुभवति मुक्तः। कुतः? दृष्टत्वात् — परब्रह्मोपसंपत्त्या निवृत्ताविद्यातिरोधानस्य याथातथ्येन स्वात्मनो दृष्टत्वात्। स्वात्मनः स्वरूपं हि

'तत्त्वमसि' (छा. ६।८।७)
'अयमात्मा ब्रह्म' (बृ. २।५।१९)
'ऐतदात्म्यमिदं सर्वम्' (छा. ६।८।७)
'सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्म' (छा. ३।१४।१)

इत्यादिसामानाधिकरण्यनिर्देशैः

'य आत्मनि तिष्ठन्नात्मनोऽन्तरो यमात्मा न वेद यस्यात्मा शरीरं य आत्मानमन्तरो यमयति स त आत्मान्तर्याम्यमृतः' (श. ब्रा १४।६।७।३०)
'अन्तः प्रविष्टः शास्ता जनानां सर्वात्मा' (तै. आ. ३।११।२)

इत्यादिभिश्च परमात्मात्मकं तच्छरीरतया तत्प्रकारभूतमिति प्रतिपादितम्

'अवस्थितेरिति काशकृत्स्नः' (ब्र. सू. १।४।२२)

इत्यत्र। अतोऽविभागेनाहं ब्रह्मास्मीत्येवानुभवति। साम्यसाधर्म्यव्यपदेशो ब्रह्मप्रकारभूतस्यैव प्रत्यगात्मनः स्वरूपं तत्सममिति देवादिप्राकृतरूपप्रहाणेन ब्रह्मसमानशुद्धिं प्रतिपादयति।

Avibhāgena — The Released one experiences himself as not separate from the Highest Brahman. Whence? Drṣṭatvāt — On account of one's own Ātman being seen in his real nature when the screening by the Avidyā ceases, owing to the attainment to the Highest Brahman.

'That thou art' (Chā. 6·8·7)
'This Ātman, Brahman' (Br. 2·5·19)
'All this has this as the Ātman' (Chā. 6·8·7)
'All this, verily, Brahman' (Chā. 3·14·1)

— *Here (in these passages)* has been propounded *the nature of one's own* Ātman by the references in case-co-ordination and by (the passages)

'Who abiding in Ātman, within Ātman, whom knows not; whose body, Ātman; who controls the Ātman within — that your Ātman, the inner Controller, immortal (Śa. Brā. 14·6·7·30)
'Entered within, the ruler of people, the Ātman of all' (Tai. Ā. 3·11·2)

etc., as having the Paramātman as his Ātman, and being a mode of him, as his body, here (in the Sūtra)

'On account of his abiding, so Kāśakṛtsna' (Bra Sū. I. 4·22)

Therefore, he experiences himself as not divided, only as — I am Brahman. The reference to the equality and the possession of the same qualities, propounds the purity equal to that of Brahman by the abandonment of the ordinary forms of gods etc., because the nature of the inmost Ātman who is, verily, the mode of Brahman is equal to it. As for the Śruti-passage mentioning accompaniment, as it propounds the experience of the qualities of

सहश्रुतिस्त्वेवंभूतस्य प्रत्यगात्मनः प्रकारिणा ब्रह्मणा सह तद्गुणानुभवं प्रतिपादयतीति न कश्चिद्विरोधः। ब्रह्मप्रकारतया तदविभागोक्तेर्हि

'संकल्पादेव तच्छ्रुतेः' (ब्र. सू. ४।४।८)

इत्यादि न विरुध्यते

'अधिकं तु भेदनिर्देशात्' (ब्र. सू. २।१।२२)

'अधिकोपदेशात्' (ब्र. सू. ३।४।८)

इत्यादि च ॥४॥

अविभागेन दृष्टत्वाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (२)

ब्राह्मेण जैमिनिरुपन्यासादिभ्यः ॥ ५ ॥

(अधिकरण ३, सूत्राणि ५–७)

[538] प्रत्यगात्मनः परं ज्योतिरुपसंपद्य निवृत्ततिरोधानस्य स्वरूपाविर्भाव एवेत्युक्तम्। तत्र येन स्वरूपेणायमात्माविर्भवति तत्स्वरूपं श्रुतिवैविध्याद्विचार्यते — किमपहतपाप्मत्वादिकमेवास्य स्वरूपमिति तेन रूपेणायमाविर्भवति, उत विज्ञानमात्रमेवेति तेन रूपेण, अथोभयोरविरोध इत्युभयरूपेण? इति। किं तावत्प्राप्तम्? ब्राह्मेण, इति जैमिनिराचार्यो मन्यते।

Brahman along with Brahman possessed of the modes, in the case of such an inmost Ātman, — there is no contradiction of any kind. And on account of the non-division being spoken of owing to this being the mode of Brahman, the Sūtra

'On account of thought alone, on account of that Śruti' (Bra. Sū. IV. 4·8)

etc., is not contradicted; as also (the Sūtras)

'But additional, owing to the reference to distinction' (Bra. Sū. II·1·22)

'Owing to the instruction about additional' (Bra. Sū. III·4·8)

॥ 4 ॥

Here ends the Avibhāgena drstatvādhikarana (2)

By the nature of Brahman, (says) Jaimini; on account of the introduction etc. ॥ 5 ॥

(Adhikarana 3, Sūtras 5–7)

[538] It has been said that in the case of the inmost Ātman from whom the veil has been removed on having gone unto the highest Jyotis, there is the manifestation of his own form alone — There is now considered his nature — by which nature this Ātman becomes manifest on account of the variety of Sruti-passages – Because the nature of this one is only having the sins destroyed, etc., — does he become manifest by that form; or, because he is mere Vijñāna, by that form; or because there is no contradiction, in both the forms? What then (is the prima facie view) reached? By the nature of Brahman, — so thinks the preceptor Jaimini. Brāhmeṇa — that is to say,

ब्राह्मेण — अपहतपाप्मत्वादिनेत्यर्थः। अपहतपाप्मत्वादयो हि दहरवाक्ये ब्रह्मसंबन्धितया श्रुताः। ब्राह्मेणेति कुतोऽवगम्यते ? उपन्यासादिभ्यः — उपन्यस्यन्ते हि ब्रह्मगुणा अपहतपाप्मत्वादयः प्रत्यगात्मनोऽपि प्रजापतिवाक्ये

'य आत्मापहतपाप्मा' (छा. ८।७।१)

इत्यादिना

'सत्यसंकल्प'

इत्यन्तेन। आदिशब्देन सत्यसंकल्पत्वादिगुणायत्ता जक्षणादयः

'जक्षत्क्रीडन्रममाणः' (छा. ८।१२।३)

इत्यादिवाक्यावगतव्यवहारा गृह्यन्ते। अत एभ्य उपन्यासादिभ्यः प्रत्यगात्मनो विज्ञानमात्रस्वरूपत्वं न संभवतीति जैमिनेर्मतम् ॥ ५ ॥

चितितन्मात्रेण तदात्मकत्वादित्यौडुलोमिः ॥ ६ ॥

[539] चैतन्यमात्रमेवास्यात्मनः स्वरूपमिति तेन रूपेणाविर्भवतीत्यौडुलोमिराचार्यो मन्यते। कुतः ? तदात्मकत्वात् — तावन्मात्रात्मकत्वादस्य प्रत्यगात्मनः।

'स यथा सैन्धवघनोऽनन्तरोऽबाह्यः कृत्स्नो रसघन एवैवं वा अरेऽयमात्माऽनन्तरोऽबाह्यः कृत्स्नः प्रज्ञानघन एव' (बृ. ४।५।१३)

'विज्ञानघन एव' (बृ. २।४।१२)

---

by having the sins destroyed etc, for, having the sins destroyed etc., are mentioned in the Śruti as being connected with Brahman in the Dahara-passage. Whence is it known (that the manifestation is) Brāhmena? — Upanyāsādibhyaḥ — for, the attributes of Brahman, — having the sins destroyed etc., are set forth in the case of the inmost Ātman also, in the Prajāpati-passage beginning with

'Who, the Ātman having sins destroyed'

and ending with

'Having thoughts fulfilled' (Chā. 8·7·1)

—By the word Ādi are to be understood eating etc., depending upon the attributes, having thoughts fulfilled, etc., the practical dealings known from the passage

'Eating, sporting, enjoying' (Chā. 8·12·3)

etc. Therefore, on account of these statements in the introduction etc., it is not possible that the inmost Ātman should have merely Vijñāna as his nature — this (is) the view of Jaimini. ॥ 5 ॥

In pure consciousness, on account of being constituted of that — thus Auḍulomi ॥ 5 ॥

[539] The nature of this Atman is pure consciousness alone, and so, he becomes manifest in that form — so thinks the preceptor Auḍulomi. Whence? Tadātmakatvāt — on account of this inmost Ātman being possessed of that much; on account of the emphatic statement (the use of Eva) in

'He, — as a mass of salt, inside as well as outside, the whole of it is only a mass of Rasa, in the same way, dear one, this Ātman, inside as well as outside, the whole of him is a mass of Prajñāna alone' (Br. 4·5·13)

'A mass of Vijñāna alone' (Br. 2·4·12)

इत्यवधारणाद्विज्ञानमात्रमेवास्य स्वरूपमित्यवगम्यते। अतोऽस्य गुणान्तराभावादपहतपाप्मेत्यादयः शब्दा विकारसुखदुःखाद्यविद्यात्मकधर्मव्यावृत्तिपरा इति चितितन्मात्ररूपेणाविर्भाव इत्यौडुलोमेर्मतम् ॥ ६ ॥

[540] संप्रति भगवान्बादरायणः स्वमतेन सिद्धान्तमाह —

एवमप्युपन्यासात्पूर्वभावादविरोधं बादरायणः ॥ ७ ॥

एवमपि विज्ञानमात्रस्वरूपत्वप्रतिपादने सत्यपि सत्यकामत्वादीनां पूर्वोक्तानां गुणानामविरोधं बादरायण आचार्यो मन्यते। कुतः? उपन्यासात्पूर्वभावात् — औपनिषदात्

'य आत्मापहतपाप्मा' (छा. ८।७।१)

इत्याद्युपन्यासात्प्रमाणात्पूर्वेषामपहतपाप्मत्वसत्यकामत्वादीनामपि भावाद्विद्यमानत्वात्। तुल्यप्रमाणकानामितरेतरबाधो न युज्यत इत्यर्थः। न च वस्तुविरोधादपहतपाप्मत्वादीनामविद्यापरिकल्पितत्वं न्याय्यम्, विशेषाभावाद्विपरीतं कस्माच्च भवतीति न्यायात्। तुल्यबलत्वे ह्यशक्यस्यावधारणस्यान्यपरत्वमेव न्याय्यम्। एवमप्यविरोध इत्यभ्युपगम्य यदज्ञानमात्रमेवास्य स्वरूपं नान्यत्किञ्चिदस्तीत्ययमर्थः

—it is known that the nature of this one is pure Vijñāna alone. Therefore, on account of the absence of other qualities in his case, the words Apahatapāpma etc., are calculated to exclude the characteristics constituted of Avidyā, modification, happiness, misery etc, — and so, there is the manifestation in the form of pure consciousness itself — this (is) the view of Auḍulomi ॥ 6 ॥

[540] Now His Holiness Bādarāyaṇa makes the conclusive statement in his own view.

Even if thus on account of the introductory statement, on account of (the attributes) existing previously, no contradiction, (says) Bādarāyaṇa ॥ 7 ॥

Evamapi — even though there be the propounding of the nature being pure Vijnāna, the preceptor Bādarāyana thinks that there is no contradiction with the attributes — with desires fulfilled etc., that are already mentioned. Whence? Upanyāsātpūrvabhāvāt — On account of the existence of — having the sins destroyed, having the desires fulfilled etc., (mentioned) before — these existing, being present on account of the authority viz. the introductory statements in the Upanisads such as—

'Who the Ātman, having sins destroyed' (Chā. 8·7·1)

etc., that is to say, in the case of equal authority, stultification of the one by the other is not right. Nor again is it right those with that — having sins destroyed etc., are superimposed by Avidyā, on account of the contradiction with the nature of things, on account of the maxim — When there is no distinction, there could be no opposite any way—for, when there is equal power, it is but proper that an impossible emphatic statement should be construed as referring to another. Having understood there is thus no contradiction, saying that only pure knowledge is his nature, nothing else exists, —this is not propounded by (the Sruti - passage).

' विज्ञानघन एव ' (बृ. २।४।१२)

इत्यादिभिर्न प्रतिपाद्यत इति मन्यते।

कस्तर्हि

' विज्ञानघन एव ' (बृ. २।४।१२)

इत्यवधारणार्थः ? कृत्स्नोऽप्यात्मा जडव्यावृत्तः स्वप्रकाशो नान्यायत्तप्रकाशः स्वल्पोऽपि प्रदेशोऽस्तीत्ययमर्थो वाक्यादेव सुव्यक्तः

' स यथा सैन्धवघनोऽनन्तरोऽबाह्यः कृत्स्नो रसघन एवैवं वा अरेऽयमात्मानन्तरोऽबाह्यः कृत्स्नः प्रज्ञानघन एव ' (बृ. ४।५।१३)

इति। न चैवं प्रत्यगात्मनो धर्मिस्वरूपस्य कृत्स्नस्य विज्ञानघनत्वेऽप्यपहतपाप्मत्वसत्यसंकल्पत्वादिधर्मसंबन्धो वाक्यान्तरावगतो विरुध्यते। यथा सैन्धवघनस्य कृत्स्नस्य रसघनत्वे रसनेन्द्रियावगते चक्षुराद्यवगता रूपकाठिन्यादयो न विरुध्यन्ते। इदमत्र वाक्यतात्पर्यम्—यथा रसवत्त्वाम्रफलादिषु त्वगादिप्रदेशभेदेन रसभेदे सत्यपि सैन्धवघनस्य सर्वत्रैकरसत्वं तथात्मनोऽपि सर्वत्र विज्ञानस्वरूपत्वं स्वप्रकाशस्वरूपत्वमित्यर्थः॥ ७॥

ब्राह्माधिकरणं समाप्तम् (३)

' A mass of Vijñāna alone ' (Br. 2·4·12)

etc;,—this is what (Bādarāyaṇa) opines.

What then is the purport of the emphatic statement (Eva) in

' A mass of Vijñāna alone ' (Br. 2·4·12)

— Even this entire Ātman other than the non-sentient, self-illumining—there is not the smallest region with its light dependent upon something — this sense is quite manifest from the passage itself —

' He, as a mass of salt, inside as well as outside, the whole of it is a mass of Rasa alone, — thus, verily, dear one, this Ātman, inside as well as outside, the whole of him, is a mass of Prajñāna alone ' (Br. 4·5·13)

— Nor again is thereby contradicted the association with the attributes, having sins destroyed, having desires fulfilled etc., known from other passages, even though this inmost Ātman with the nature of one possessed of attributes, be a massed Vijñāna in entirety. Just as the mass of salt, even though a mass of Rasa in its entirety is known from the sense-organ of Rasa, (the qualities), form, hardness etc., known from the eye etc., are not contradicted. This is the purport of the passage here — Just as though there is the difference of the flavour on account of the difference of regions such as the outside bark etc., in the case of the juicy mango-fruit etc., there is oneness of Rasa everywhere in the case of the mass of salt; in the same way in the case of the Ātman also everywhere there is the nature of Vijñāna, that is to say, self-illumining nature. ॥ 7 ॥

Here ends the Brāhmādhikaraṇa (3)

संकल्पादेव तच्छ्रुतेः ॥ ८ ॥

(अधिकरण ४, सू. ८–९)

[**541**] मुक्तः परं ब्रह्मोपसंपद्य ज्ञानस्वरूपोऽपहतपाप्मत्वादिसत्यसंकल्पत्व-पर्यन्तगुणक आविर्भवतीत्युक्तम् । तमधिकृत्य तस्य सत्यसंकल्पत्वप्रयुक्ता व्यवहाराः श्रूयन्ते-

' स तत्र पर्येति जक्षत्क्रीडन्नममाणः स्त्रीभिर्वा यानैर्वा ज्ञातिभिर्वा '

(छा. ८।१२।३)

इति । किमस्य ज्ञात्यादिप्राप्तिः प्रयत्नान्तरसापेक्षा, उत परमपुरुषस्येव संकल्पमात्रादेव भवति ? इति विशये, लोके राजादीनां सत्यसंकल्पत्वेन व्यवह्रियमाणानां कार्यनिष्पादने प्रयत्नान्तरसापेक्षत्वदर्शनादस्यापि तत्सापेक्षेति प्राप्ते, उच्यते—

संकल्पादेव, इति । कुतः ? तच्छ्रुतेः—

' स यदि पितृलोककामो भवति संकल्पादेवास्य पितरः समुत्तिष्ठन्ति '

(छा. ८।२।१)

इति हि संकल्पादेवास्य पित्रादीनां समुत्थानं श्रूयते । न च प्रयत्नान्तरसव्यपेक्षत्वाभिधायि श्रुत्यन्तरं दृश्यते येनास्य संकल्पादेवेत्यवधारणस्य

' विज्ञानघन एव ' (बृ. २।४।१२)

इतिवत्, व्यवस्थापनं क्रियते ॥ ८ ॥

From the thought itself, on account of that Śruti ॥ 8 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 4, Sūtras 8–9)

[541] It has been stated that the released (Soul) having attained to the Highest Brahman becomes manifest with Jñāna as his nature and with attributes beginning with having the sins destroyed, etc., and ending with— having thoughts fulfilled. Referring to him are mentioned in the Śruti, the practical dealings prompted by having thoughts fulfilled etc.—

'He moves about there eating, sporting, enjoying, with women or with vehicles or with kinsmen' (Chā. 8·12·3)

—There being the doubt—Is his acquisition of kinsmen etc., dependent upon another effort or does it come from the mere thought, as in the case of the highest Purusa ? — Because in the world, in the case of kings and others who are spoken of as having their thoughts fulfilled, there is seen the need of a fresh effort to produce the effect in question; in the case of this one also, there is the need of that (fresh effort) — This (prima facie view) being reached, it is said (in reply) —

Saṃkalpādeva Whence ? Tatcchruteḥ — for, in (the passage)

'If he is desirous of the Pitrloka, through mere thought, his Manes rise' (Chā. 8·2·1)

the rise of the Manes etc., is mentioned in the Sruti as from thought alone. Not again, is seen another Śruti-passage mentioning the need of another effort, so that there would be the adjustment made of the emphatic statement — from thought alone—as in the case of

'A mass of Vijñāna' (Bṛ. 2·4·12)

॥ 8 ॥

अत एव चानन्याधिपतिः ॥ ९ ॥

यतो मुक्तः सत्यसंकल्पोऽत एवानन्याधिपतिश्च । अन्याधिपतित्वं हि विधिनिषेधयोग्यत्वम् । विधिनिषेधयोग्यत्वे हि प्रतिहतसंकल्पत्वं भवेत् । अतः सत्यसंकल्पत्वश्रुत्यैवानन्याधिपतित्वं च सिद्धम् । अत एव

' स स्वराड्भवति ' (छा. ७।२५।२)

इत्युच्यते ॥ ९ ॥

संकल्पाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (४)

अभावं बादरिराह ह्येवम् ॥ १० ॥

(अधिकरण ५, सूत्राणि १०–१६)

[542] किं मुक्तस्य देहेन्द्रियाणि न सन्ति, उत सन्ति, अथ वा यथासंकल्पं सन्ति न सन्ति च ? इति विशये, शरीरेन्द्रियाणामभावं बादरिराचार्यो मन्यते । कुतः ? आह ह्येवम्—

' न ह वै सशरीरस्य सतः प्रियाप्रिययोरपहतिरस्ति । अशरीरं वाव सन्तं न प्रियाप्रिये स्पृशतः ' (छा. ८।१२।१)

इति शरीरसंबन्धे सुखदुःखस्यावर्जनीयत्वमभिधाय

And for this very reason, has none else as the overlord ॥ 9 ॥

Because the Released one has his thoughts fulfilled, therefore he has also no other overlord Having some one else as the overlord, indeed, means fitness for being subject to injunction and prohibition; for, only when there is fitness for being subject to injunction and prohibition, there would be the state of thoughts being obstructed. Therefore, by the Śruti referring to having thoughts fulfilled itself, is established the state of having no other overlord For this very reason, it is stated

' He becomes the self-ruler '. (Ch. 7·25·2)

॥ 9 ॥

' Here ends the Saṁkalpādhikarana (4)

Absence, so (says) Bādari, for (the Śruti) says thus ॥ 10 ॥

(Adhikarana 5, Sūtras 10–16)

[542] There being the doubt — Are there not in the case of the Released one, body and sense-organs, or are they there, or are they there or not there, according to his thought ? — The preceptor Bādari thinks that there is the absence of body and sense-organs. Whence ? Āha hyevam — for, the Sruti speaks of the Released having no body in (the passage)

' Not indeed, in the case of one being with a body, is the destruction of the agreeable and the disagreeable; him, verily, being without a body, touch not the agreeable and the disagreeable ' (Ch. 8·12·1)

after having mentioned that happiness and misery are unavoidable when there is the connection with the body in

'अस्माच्छरीरात्समुत्थाय परं ज्योतिरुपसंपद्य स्वेन रूपेणाभिनिष्पद्यते'
(छा. ८।१२।३)

इति मुक्तस्याशरीरत्वं ह्याह श्रुतिः ॥ १० ॥

भावं जैमिनिर्विकल्पामननात् ॥ ११ ॥

[543] मुक्तस्य शरीरेन्द्रियादिभावं जैमिनिराचार्यो मन्यते। कुतः? विकल्पामननात् — विविधः कल्पो विकल्पः, वैविध्यमित्यर्थः

'स एकधा भवति त्रिधा भवति पञ्चधा सप्तधा' (छा. ७।२६।२)

इत्यादिश्रुतेः। आत्मन एकस्याच्छेद्यस्यानेकधाभावासंभवात्त्रिधाभावादयः शरीरनिबन्धना इत्यवगम्यते। अशरीरत्ववचनं तु कर्मनिमित्तशरीराभावपरम्। तदेव हि शरीरं प्रियाप्रियहेतुः ॥ ११ ॥

[544] भगवांस्तु बादरायणः स्वमतेन सिद्धान्तमाह —

द्वादशाहवदुभयविधं बादरायणोऽतः ॥ १२ ॥

संकल्पादेवेत्येतदतःशब्देन परामृश्यते। अत एव संकल्पादुभयविधं सशरीरमशरीरं च मुक्तं भगवान्बादरायणो मन्यते। एवं चोभयी श्रुतिरुपपद्यते। द्वादशाहवत् — यथा

'*Having risen up from this body, having gone unto the highest Jyotis he becomes manifest in his own nature*' (Chā. 8·12·3)

॥ 10 ॥

Existence, so Jaimini, on account of the mention of variety. ॥ 11 ॥

[543] The preceptor Jaimini thinks that there is the existence of the body, sense-organs etc., in the case of the Released one. Whence? Vikalpāmananāt — Vikalpa is the varied nature, that is to say, variety, on account of the Śruti (passage)

'*He becomes of one form, becomes three-fold, five-fold, seven-fold*' (Chā. 7·26·2)

etc. On account of the impossibility of the one indivisible Ātman existing in various ways, it is known that his being three-fold etc., depends upon the body. The statement about not being possessed of a body, however, refers to the absence of the body due to Karman; for, that body alone is the cause of the agreeable and the disagreeable. ॥ 11 ॥

[544] His Holiness Bādarāyaṇa however, states the conclusive view in accordance with his own opinion —

Like the Dvādaśāha, twofold — So Bādarāyaṇa, from that ॥ 12 ॥

By the word Ataḥ is the reference to Saṁkalpādeva. For this very reason, — from the thought — His Holiness Bādarāyaṇa thinks the Released one to be Ubhayavidha (two-fold), — having a body and having no body. And thus the two-fold Śruti would be appropriate. Dvādaśāhavat — like the Dvādaśāha (sacrifice). Just as in

'द्वादशाहमृद्धिकामा उपेयुः' (ता. ब्रा. २३।२३।१)
'द्वादशाहेन प्रजाकामं याजयेत्'

इत्युपैतियजतिचोदनाभ्यां संकल्पभेदेन सत्रमहीनं च भवति ॥ १२ ॥

यदा शरीराद्युपकरणवत्त्वं तदा तानि शरीराद्युपकरणानि स्वेनैव सृष्टानीति नास्ति नियम इत्याह —

तन्वभावे संध्यवदुपपत्तेः ॥ १३ ॥

स्वेनैव सृष्टतनुप्रभृत्युपकरणाभावे परमपुरुषसृष्टैरुपकरणैर्भोगोपपत्तेः सत्यसंकल्पोऽपि स्वयं न सृजति । यथा स्वप्ने

'अथ रथान्रथयोगान्पथः सृजते' (बृ. ४।३।१०)

इत्यारभ्य

'अथ वेशान्तान्पुष्करिण्यः स्रवन्तः सृजते स हि कर्ता' (बृ. ४।३।१०)

इति

'य एष सुप्तेषु जागर्ति कामं कामं पुरुषो निर्मिमाणः ।
तदेव शुक्रं तद्ब्रह्म तदेवामृतमुच्यते ।
तस्मिँल्लोकाः श्रिताः सर्वे तदु नात्येति कश्चन ।' (का. २।२।८)

'Those desirous of prosperity should perform the Dvādaśāha' (*sacrifice*). *'One should make one desirous of progeny sacrifice by the Dvādaśāha'* (Tāndya Brā. 23 23·1)

— by the injunctive expressions Upaiti — performs and Yajati — sacrifices the sacrifice becomes in conformity with the difference in aim, a long sacrifice and a day-sacrifice. ॥ 12 ॥

When in his case, there is the possession of accessories like the body etc. then there is no definite rule that those accessories body etc., are created by himself — Thus says (the Sūtrakāra)

In the absence of the body, as in dream (enjoyment) possible ॥ **13** ॥

When there is the absence of accessories such as the created body etc, by himself, although he has his thoughts fullfilled, he himself does not create because enjoyment is possible with the accessories created by the highest Purusa. Just as in a dream, in accordance with (the passage) beginning with

'Then he creates the chariots and horses yoked to the chariots'

'Then he creates mansions, lotus-ponds and flowing rivers, for he (is) the doer' (Br 4·3·10)

and in

'Who, this one, the Purusa remains awake, creating repeatedly at will — that itself refulgent, that Brahman, that itself is called immortal, in it are located all the worlds; nothing whatsoever goes beyond it' (Kā 2·2·8)

इति चेश्वरसृष्टे रथाद्युपकरणैर्जीवो भुङ्क्ते तथा मुक्तोऽपि लीलाप्रवृत्तेनेश्वरेण सृष्टैः पितृलोकादिभिर्लीलारसं भुङ्क्ते ॥ १३ ॥

भावे जाग्रद्वत् ॥ १४ ॥

[545] स्वसंकल्पादेव सृष्टतनुप्रभृतिपितृलोकाद्युपकरणभावे जाग्रत्पुरुषभोगवन्मुक्तो लीलारसं भुङ्क्ते । परमपुरुषोऽपि लीलार्थं दशरथवसुदेवादिपितृलोकादिकमात्मनः सृष्ट्वा तैर्मनुष्यधर्मलीलारसं यथा भुङ्क्ते, तथा मुक्तानामपि स्वलीलार्थं पितृलोकादिकं स्वयमेव सृजति कदाचित् । कदाचिच्च मुक्ताः सत्यसंकल्पत्वात्परमपुरुषलीलान्तर्गतस्वपितृलोकादिकं स्वयमेव सृजन्तीति सर्वमुपपन्नम् ॥ १४ ॥

[546] नन्वात्माणुपरिमाण इत्युक्तम् । कथमनेकशरीरेष्वेकस्याणोरात्माभिमानसंभवः ? इत्यत्राह —

प्रदीपवदावेशस्तथा हि दर्शयति ॥ १५ ॥

यथा प्रदीपस्यैकस्यैकस्मिन्देशे वर्तमानस्य स्वप्रभया देशान्तरावेशस्तथात्मनोऽप्येकदेशस्थितस्यैव स्वप्रभारूपेण चैतन्येन सर्वशरीरावेशो नानुपपन्नः । यथा चैकस्मिन्नपि देहे हृदयाद्येकप्रदेशवर्तिनोऽपि चैतन्यव्याप्त्या सर्वस्मिन्देह आत्माभिमानस्तद्वत् । इयान्विशेषः —

—Jīva enjoys by the accessories, chariots etc., created by the Lord; the Released one also enjoys the pleasure of the sportive action in the world of Pitṛs etc., created by the Lord proceeding in sport. ॥ 13 ॥

When existing, like the waking person ॥ 14 ॥

[545] When there are the accessories Pitṛloka etc., and the created body etc., from his own thought itself, the Released one enjoys the pleasure of the sportive action, like the enjoyment by a waking person. Just as even the Paramapuruṣa for (mere) sport, having created from himself Daśaratha, Vasudeva etc., and the Pitṛloka etc., enjoys the pleasure of enjoyment in acting like a human being through them; in the same way He himself sometimes creates Pitṛloka etc., in the case of the Released souls for his own sport. And sometimes the Released souls of their own accord create their own Pitṛloka etc., included within the sport of the Paramapuruṣa on account of their thoughts coming to be fulfilled — so everything is all right. ॥ 14 ॥

[546] I say (says the objector) — It has been stated that Ātman is atomic in size. How can there be the possibility of one atom regarding himself as the Ātman in many bodies ?—(The Sūtrakāra) says in this connection—

Occupying like the lamp; to the same effect the Śruti shows ॥ 15 ॥

Just as the one lamp staying in one region occupies (extends over) another region by its lustre, in the same way it is not impossible that Ātman although residing in one region himself, occupies the whole of the body by consciousness in the form of his lustre. And just as in the case of (the atomic Ātman) — residing only in one region — heart etc., in one and the same body, there is the acknowledgement of tha Ātman in the whole of the body, on account of the pervasion of consciousness — like that. (But) this (is) the difference —

अमुक्तस्य कर्मणा संकुचितज्ञानस्य देहान्तरेष्वात्माभिमानानुगुणा व्याप्तिर्न संभवति। मुक्तस्य त्वसंकुचितज्ञानस्य यथासंकल्पमात्माभिमानानुगुणा व्याप्तिरिदमिति ग्रहणानुगुणा च नानुपपन्ना। तथाहि दर्शयति

'बालाग्रशतभागस्य शतधा कल्पितस्य च।
भागो जीवः स विज्ञेयः स चानन्त्याय कल्पते॥' (श्वे ५।९)

इति। अमुक्तस्य कर्म नियामकं मुक्तस्य तु स्वेच्छेति विशेषः॥ १५॥

[547] ननु परं ब्रह्म प्राप्तस्यान्तरबाह्यज्ञानलोपं दर्शयति श्रुतिः

'प्राज्ञेनात्मना संपरिष्वक्तो न बाह्यं किंचन वेद नान्तरम्' (बृ ४।३।२१)

इति। तत्कथं मुक्तस्य सार्वज्ञ्यमुच्यते? तत्रोत्तरम्—

स्वाप्ययसंपत्त्योरन्यतरापेक्षमाविष्कृतं हि॥ १६॥

नेदं वचनं मुक्तविषयम्, अपि तु स्वाप्ययसंपत्त्योरन्यतरापेक्षम्। स्वाप्ययः सुषुप्तिरित्युक्तम्। संपत्तिश्च मरणम्

'वाङ्मनसि संपद्यते' (छा ६।८।६)

In the case of the non-Released one whose knowledge is contracted on account of the Karman, the pervasion pertaining to the acknowledgement of the Atman in other bodies is not possible. In the case of the Released one, however, with his knowledge without contraction, the pervasion pertaining to the acknowledgement of the Atman at his own will, and capable of (understanding) grasping in the form of — this — is not impossible To the same effect shows the Sruti —

'*That Jiva should be known as (having a dimension of) the portion, the hundredth part of the tip of the hair cut into a hundred bits, he is earmarked for eternity*' (Śve. 5 9)

In the case of the non-Released one, Karman is the controlling factor, but in the case of the Released one it is his free will—this (is) the distinction. *॥ 15 ॥*

[547] I say (says the objector)—In the case of one who has attained to the Highest Brahman, the Sruti describes (shows) the absence of internal and external knowledge —

'*Closely contacted with the Prājña Ātman, he knows neither anything outside, nor inside*' (Br 4 3 21)

— So, how is the omniscience spoken of in the case of the Released one? — There (is this) answer—

Referring to either of (the two) deep sleep (and) death; for, that is disclosed (by the Śruti) ॥ 16 ॥

Not (indeed) is this statement about the Released one, but referring to either of the two, the deep-sleep-state and death It has been stated — Svāpyaya is deep sleep, and Sampatti is death, on account of the statement beginning with

'*The Vāk goes unto the mind*' (Chā. 6 8 6)

इत्यारभ्य

'तेज: परस्यां देवतायाम्' (छा. ६।८।६)

इति वचनात्। तयोश्चावस्थयोः प्राज्ञप्राप्तिर्निःसंबोधत्वं च विद्यते, अतस्तयोरन्यतरापेक्षमिदं वचनम्। सुषुप्तिमरणयोर्निःसंबोधत्वं मुक्तस्य च सर्वज्ञत्वमाविष्कृतं हि श्रुत्या—

'नाह खल्वयमेवं संप्रत्यात्मानं जानात्ययमहमस्मीति नो एवेमानि भूतानि विनाशमेवापीतो भवति नाहमत्र भोग्यं पश्यामि' (छा. ८।११।१)

इति सुषुप्तिवेलायां निःसंबोधत्वमुक्त्वा तस्मिन्नेव वाक्ये मुक्तमधिकृत्य

'स वा एष दिव्येन चक्षुषा मनसैतान्कामान्पश्यन्रमते य एते ब्रह्मलोके' (छा ८।१२।५-६)

इति सर्वज्ञत्वमुच्यते। तथा

'सर्वं ह पश्यः पश्यति सर्वमाप्नोति सर्वशः' (छा ७।२६।२)

इति च स्पष्टमेव सर्वज्ञत्वमुच्यते। तथा मरणे च निःसंबोधत्वम्

'एतेभ्यो भूतेभ्यः समुत्थाय तान्येवानुविनश्यति' (बृ २।४।१२)

इत्युक्तम्। विनश्यति, न पश्यतीत्यर्थः। अतः प्राज्ञेनात्मनेति वचनं स्वाप्ययसंपत्त्योरन्यतरापेक्षम्॥ १६॥

अभावाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (५)

(and ending with)

'*The Tejas unto the highest Deity*' (Chā 6 8 6

—And in those two states there does exist the attainment to Prājña and absence of all consciousness Therefore, this statement refers to either of the two, for it is disclosed by the Sruti, the absence of consciousness in deep sleep and death and the omniscience of the Released one. Having spoken of the absence of all consciousness at the time of deep sleep,

'*Not indeed this one thus knows the Ātman—now here, I am he, not indeed these beings, he goes unto destruction itself— I do not see here any object of enjoyment*'

(Chā 8 11 1)

— in that same passage is spoken of omniscience referring to the Released one,

'*He, verily, this one, seeing these desires by the divine eye, by the mind, enjoys, what these are in the Brahmaloka*'

(Chā 8 12 5–6)

— similarly, in (the passage)

'*The seer, indeed, sees everything, secures everything in all ways*' (Cha 7 26 2)

the omniscience is spoken of very clearly —Similarly, in death also the absence of all consciousness is spoken of in

'*Having risen up from these elements, he perishes after them alone*' (Br 2 4·12)

Vinasyati — that is to say, does not see Therefore the statement Prājñena Ātmanā refers to either of (the two) — deep sleep and death ‖ 16 ‖

Here ends the Abhāvādhikarana (5)

जगद्व्यापारवर्जं प्रकरणादसंनिहितत्वाच्च ॥ १७ ॥

(अधिकरण ६, सूत्राणि १७–२२)

[548] किं मुक्तस्यैश्वर्यं जगत्सृष्ट्यादि परमपुरुषासाधारणं सर्वेश्वरत्वमपि, उत तद्रहितं केवलपरमपुरुषानुभवविषयम् ? इति संशयः — किं युक्तम् ? जगदीश्वरत्वमपीति । कुतः ?

' *निरञ्जनः परमं साम्यमुपैति* ' (मु. ३।१।३)

इति परमपुरुषेण परमसाम्यापत्तिश्रुतेः, सत्यसंकल्पत्वश्रुतेश्च । न हि परमसाम्यसत्यसंकल्पत्वे सर्वेश्वरासाधारणजगद्व्यापाररूपजगन्नियमनेन विनोपपद्येते । अतः, सत्यसंकल्पत्वपरमसाम्योपपत्तये समस्तजगन्नियमनरूपमपि मुक्तस्यैश्वर्यमिति । एवं प्राप्ते, प्रचक्ष्महे—

जगद्व्यापारवर्जम्, इति । जगद्व्यापारो निखिलचेतनाचेतनस्वरूपस्थितिप्रवृत्तिभेदनियमनम्, तद्वर्जं निरस्तनिखिलतिरोधानस्य निर्व्याजब्रह्मानुभवरूपं मुक्तस्यैश्वर्यम् । कुतः ? प्रकरणात् । निखिलजगन्नियमनं हि परं ब्रह्म प्रकृत्याम्नायते—

Barring the operation about the world, on account of the context, and on account of his not being present ॥ 17 ॥

(Adhikaraṇa 6, Sūtras 17-22)

[548] There is (the) doubt — Is the glory of the Released one the state of being the overlord also, peculiar to the Paramapurusa, involving the creation of the world etc., or, is it devoid of that, confined to the experience of only the Paramapurusa ? What proper ? The overlordship of the world also. Whence ? On account of the mention in the Sruti of the attainment to the maximum similarity with the highest Purusa in (the passage)

' *Free from stains, he attains to the maximum similarity* ' (Mu. 3·1·3)

and also on account of the Sruti referring to his having his thoughts fulfilled. Not, indeed, would be appropriate extreme resemblance and having the thoughts fulfilled, without the control of the world in the form of operations in connection with the world, peculiar to the all-Lord. Therefore, to account for having the thoughts fulfilled and the maximum resemblance, the wealth of glory of the Released one is also of the form of the entire world-control.—This (prima facie view) being reached, we say (in reply) —

Jagadvyāpāravarjam.—Jagadvyāpārah — Operation in connection with the world (is) the control of the diverse nature, stability and activity of the entire sentient and non-sentient entities. Barring that, is the wealth of glory of the Released one with the entire veil completely taken off, having the form of realisation of the pure Brahman. Whence ? Prakaranāt—On account of the context; for, the control of the entire world is mentioned, referring to the Highest Brahman in

' यतो वा इमानि भूतानि जायन्ते । येन जातानि जीवन्ति । यत्प्रयन्त्यभिसंविशन्ति । तद्विजिज्ञासस्व । तद्ब्रह्म ' (तै. ३।१)

इति। यद्येतन्निखिलजगन्नियमनं मुक्तानामपि साधारणं स्यात्, तत इदं जगदीश्वरत्वरूपं ब्रह्मलक्षणं न संगच्छते। असाधारणस्य हि लक्षणत्वम्। तथा

' सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीदेकमेवाद्वितीयम् । तदैक्षत बहु स्यां प्रजायेयेति । तत्तेजोऽसृजत ' (छा. ६।२।२-३)

इति।

' ब्रह्म वा इदमग्र आसीदेकमेव । तदेकं सन्न व्यभवत् । तच्छ्रेयोरूपमत्यसृजत क्षत्रं यान्येतानि देवत्रा क्षत्राणीन्द्रो वरुणः सोमो रुद्रः पर्जन्यो यमो मृत्युरीशान. ' (बृ. १।४।११)

इति।

' आत्मा वा इदमेक एवाग्र आसीन्नान्यत्किंचन मिषत्स ऐक्षत लोकान्नु सृजा इति स इमाँल्लोकानसृजत ' (ऐ. १।१-२)

इति।

' एको ह वै नारायण आसीन्न ब्रह्मा नेशानो नेमे द्यावापृथिवी न नक्षत्राणि नापो नाग्निर्न सोमो न सूर्यः स एकाकी न रमते तस्य ध्यानान्तस्थस्यैका कन्या दशेन्द्रियाणि ' (महो. १)

'From which indeed are originated these beings, by which they live, when born, which they go to, (and) which they go into; know that: that (is) Brahman' (Tai. 3·1).

If this control of the entire world were to be common to the Released ones also, then this characteristic of Brahman, of the form of being the overlord of the world would not go well, for, only a peculiar characteristic can be a defining factor. Similarly,

'Sat alone, dear one, was this at the beginning, one alone, without a second; it reflected — May I be many, may I procreate, — it created Tejas' (Chā. 6·2 2-3)

'Brahman, verily, was this at the beginning, one alone. That, being one, did not become modified, it super-created the form of the highest good, the Ksatra (caste), what are the Ksatras among gods, — Indra, Varuna, Soma, Rudra, Parjanya, Yama, Mrtyu, (death), Īśāna'. (Br. 1·4·11)

'Ātman verily, this one, was one alone at the beginning, nothing else, blinking; he reflected — May I indeed create the worlds — he created these worlds,' (Ai. 1·1–2)

— In

'One alone, verily, was Nārāyana, nor Brahmadeva, nor Īśāna (Siva); nor these, heaven and the earth; nor the stars, nor the waters, nor fire, nor Soma, nor the Sun; alone he enjoys not, of him engaged in meditation, one daughter, ten sense-organs' (Maho. 1)

etc.,

इत्यादिषु

' यः पृथिव्यां तिष्ठन्पृथिव्या अन्तरः ' (श ब्रा १४।६।७।७)

इत्यारभ्य

' य आत्मनि तिष्ठन् ' (श ब्रा १४।६।७।३०)

इत्यादिषु च निखिलजगन्नियमनं परमपुरुष प्रकृत्यैव श्रूयते। असंनिहितत्वाच्च — न चैतेषु निखिलजगन्नियमनप्रसङ्गेषु मुक्तस्य संनिधानमस्ति येन जगद्व्यापारस्तस्यापि स्यात् ॥ १७ ॥

प्रत्यक्षोपदेशान्नेति चेन्नाधिकारिकमण्डलस्थोक्तेः ॥ १८ ॥

[549]

' स स्वराड्भवति तस्य सर्वेषु लोकेषु कामचारो भवति ' (छा ७।२५।२)

' इमाँल्लोकान्कामान्नी कामरूप्यनुसंचरन् ' (तै ३।१०।५)

इति प्रत्यक्षेण श्रुत्या मुक्तस्य जगद्व्यापार उपदिश्यते। अतो न जगद्व्यापारवर्जमिति चेत्—तन्न, आधिकारिकमण्डलस्थोक्तेः । आधिकारिका —अधिकारेषु नियुक्ता हिरण्यगर्भादय । मण्डलानि—तेषां लोकाः । तत्रस्था भोगा मुक्तस्याकर्मवश्यस्य भवन्तीत्ययमर्थः

' तस्य सर्वेषु लोकेषु कामचारो भवति ' (छा ७ २५।२)

---

and in passages beginning with

'Who, abiding in Prthivi, within Prthivi'

(Śa Bra 14 6 7 7)

'Who abiding in the Ātman (Śa. Bra 14 6 7 30)

etc the control of the entire world is mentioned in the Sruti as referring to the Paramapurusa alone — and on account of his not being near — Not again on these occasions of controlling the whole world there is the proximity of the Released one so that there would be world operation by him also ‖ 17 ‖

Not so, on account of the direct teaching (we say) — No on account the mention (of the enjoyments) within the jurisdiction of the appointed officers ‖ **18** ‖

[549] If (it be objected) that

'He becomes self-ruler in all the worlds, there is his movement at will (Chā 7 25 2)

'Having food at will, taking (any) form at will, moving about in these worlds (Tai 3 10 5)

(in these passages) by the Sruti is directly taught the operation of the world in the case of the Released (soul) Therefore, not barring the operation of the world — (we say) —No Ādhikārikamandalasthokteh — Ādhikārikāh — appointed for the different posts Hiranyagarbha and others Mandalāni — their worlds The enjoyments there are in the case of the Released one not subject to the Karman — this purport is conveyed by

'In all the worlds, there is his movement at will'

(Chā 7 25 2)

इत्यादिनोच्यते। अकर्मप्रतिहतज्ञानो मुक्तो विकारिलोकान्ब्रह्मविभूतिभूताननुभूय यथाकामं तृप्यतीत्यर्थः। तदेवं विकारान्तर्वर्तिन आधिकारिकमण्डलस्थान्सर्वान्भोगान्ब्रह्मविभूतिभूताननुभवतीत्यनेन वाक्येनोच्यते, न जगद्व्यापारः ॥ १८ ॥

[550] यदि संसारिवन्मुक्तोऽपि विकारान्तर्वर्तिनो भोगान्भुङ्क्ते, तर्हि बद्धस्येव मुक्तस्याप्यन्तवदेव भोग्यजातमल्पं च स्यात्। तत्राह —

विकारावर्ति च तथा हि स्थितिमाह ॥ १९ ॥

विकारे जन्मादिके न वर्तत इति विकारावर्ति। निर्धूतनिखिलविकारं निखिलहेयप्रत्यनीककल्याणैकतानं निरतिशयानन्दं परं ब्रह्म सविभूतिकं सकलकल्याणगुणमनुभवति मुक्तः। तद्विभूत्यन्तर्गतत्वेन विकारवर्तिनां लोकानामपि मुक्तभोग्यत्वम्। तथा हि परस्मिन्ब्रह्मणि निर्विकारेऽनवधिकातिशयानन्दे मुक्तस्यानुभवितृत्वेन स्थितिमाह श्रुतिः

'यदा ह्येवैष एतस्मिन्नदृश्येऽनात्म्येऽनिरुक्तेऽनिलयनेऽभयं प्रतिष्ठां विन्दते। अथ सोऽभयं गतो भवति' (तै. २।७)

'रसो वै सः। रसं ह्येवायं लब्ध्वानन्दी भवति' (तै. २।७)

---

etc., The sense is that the Released one with his knowledge not stultified by Karman, having enjoyed the modified worlds that are the manifestations of the Lord, becomes gratified at his own will. Therefore, by this sentence is thus conveyed (that the Released one) enjoys all enjoyments coming within the jurisdiction of the appointed officers and abiding within the modifications, which are the glory of Brahman, not the world-operation ॥ 18 ॥

[550) If like the Soul in the Saṁsāra, even the Released one enjoys the enjoyments abiding within the modifications, then as in the case of the Bound one, in the case of the Released one also, the store of objects fit for enjoyment will surely have an end and would be just scanty — There says (the Sūtrakāra)

Not abiding in the modifications, to the same effect the Śruti describes the state ॥ 19 ॥

Vikāre — In the modification — in birth etc., does not exist — Vikārāvarti — The Released one realises the Highest Brahman with its manifestations, with all the modifications shaken away, of a uniformly auspicious nature opposed to everything fit to be abandoned, possessing an excessive bliss, and having all auspicious qualities. The worlds although within the modification are fit for being enjoyed by the Released one, as they are included in the manifestations of that. To explain the same — The Śruti explains the Released one as abiding as the realiser, in the Highest Brahman without modification, possessing unlimited excessive bliss —

'When indeed this one, verily, secures stability, freedom from fear, in this imperceptible, non-body, undefinable, without abode, then he goes to freedom from fear' (Tai. 2·7)

'Rasa, verily, (is) he; having indeed secured Rasa alone, he becomes full of Ānanda' (Tai. 2·7)

इत्यादिका । तद्विभूतिभूतं च जगत्तत्रैव वर्तते

'तस्मिँल्लोकाः श्रिताः सर्वे तदु नात्येति कश्चन' (का. ५।८)

इति श्रुतेः । अतः सविभूतिकं ब्रह्मानुभवन्विकारान्तर्वर्तिन आधिकारिकमण्डलस्थानपि भोगान्भुङ्क्त इति

'सर्वेषु लोकेषु कामचारः' (छा. ७।२५।२)

इत्यादिनोच्यते, न मुक्तस्य जगद्व्यापारः ॥ १९ ॥

दर्शयतश्चैवं प्रत्यक्षानुमाने ॥ २० ॥

[551] अस्य प्रत्यगात्मनो मुक्तस्य नियाम्यभूतस्य नियन्तृभूतपरमपुरुषासाधारणं जगद्व्यापाररूपं नियमनं न संभवतीत्युक्तम् । निखिलजगन्नियमनरूपो व्यापारः परमपुरुषासाधारण इति दर्शयतः श्रुतिस्मृती

'भीषास्माद्वातः पवते । भीषोदेति सूर्यः । भीषास्मादग्निश्चेन्द्रश्च । मृत्युर्धावति पञ्चम इति ।' (तै. २।८)

'एतस्य वा अक्षरस्य प्रशासने गार्गि सूर्याचन्द्रमसौ विधृतौ तिष्ठतः' (बृ ३।८।९)

इत्यादि । तथा

'एष सर्वेश्वर एष भूताधिपतिरेष भूतपाल एष सेतुर्विधरण एषां लोकानामसंभेदाय' (बृ. ४।४।२२)

---

etc. And the world which is its manifestation exists there, itself in accordance with the Śruti —

'In that are all the worlds resorting; no one goes beyond it' (Kā. 5·8)

Therefore, by (the passage)

'In all the worlds, free movement at will' (Chā. 7·25·2)

etc., is stated that (the Released one) realising Brahman with all its manifestations enjoys the enjoyments also within the jurisdiction of the appointed officers abiding within the modifications; and not the operation with the world by the Released one. ॥ 19 ॥

And thus show the Śruti and the Smṛti ॥ 20 ॥

[551] It has been stated that in the case of this Released inmost self who is subject to control, is not possible the control involving the operation of the world, peculiar to the Paramapuruṣa who is the Controller. The Śruti and the Smṛti show that the operation of the nature of the control of the entire world is peculiar to the Paramapurusa,

'Through fear from him, the wind blows on; through fear rises the Sun; through fear from him, Agni and Indra; Death runs as the fifth' (Tāi. 2·8)

'Under the direction, verily, of this Akṣara (O) Gārgī, the Sun and the Moon, stay on supported' (Br. 3·8·9)

ect.,—similarly the Sruti (passage)

'This one, the over-lord of all; this one the supreme master of beings; this one, the protector of Bhūtas; this one the bridge, the support, for the non-breaking of these worlds.' (Br. 4·4·22)

इति च श्रुतिः । स्मृतिरपि

'मयाध्यक्षेण प्रकृतिः सूयते सचराचरम् ।
हेतुनानेन कौन्तेय जगद्विपरिवर्तते ॥' (गीता ९।१०)

इति ।

'विष्टभ्याहमिदं कृत्स्नमेकांशेन स्थितो जगत् ।' (गीता १०।४२)

इति च। तथा मुक्तस्य सत्यसंकल्पत्वादिपूर्वकस्याप्यानन्दस्य परमपुरुष एव हेतुरिति श्रुतिस्मृती दर्शयतः

'एष ह्येवानन्दयाति' (तै. २।७)

'मां च योऽव्यभिचारेण भक्तियोगेन सेवते ।
स गुणान्समतीत्यैतान्ब्रह्मभूयाय कल्पते ॥
ब्रह्मणो हि प्रतिष्ठाहममृतस्याव्ययस्य च ।
शाश्वतस्य च धर्मस्य सुखस्यैकान्तिकस्य च ॥'
(गीता १४।२६-२७)

इति । यद्यप्यपहतपाप्मत्वादिः सत्यसंकल्पत्वपर्यन्तो गुणगणः प्रत्यगात्मनः स्वाभाविक एवाविर्भूतः, तथापि तस्य तथाविधत्वमेव परमपुरुषायत्तं तस्य नित्यस्थितिश्च तदायत्ता। परमपुरुषस्यैतन्नित्यताया नित्येष्टत्वान्नित्यतया वर्तत इति न कश्चिद्विरोधः। एवमेव परमपुरुष

So also, the Smṛti —

'*By me, the presiding authority, the Prakrti produces (everything) along with the movable and immovable; by this as the cause, (O) son of Kunti, the world revolves on*' (Gitā 9·10)

'*Having enveloped all this world, by a portion (of mine) I stay on*' (Gitā 10·42)

Similarly, the Sruti and the Smrti passages show that the Paramapurusa is the only cause of bliss in the case of the Released one who has already the attributes, — having the thoughts fulfilled etc.

'*This one alone causes Ānanda indeed*' (Tai. 2·7)

And who serves me, with single-minded Bhaktiyoga, he, having gone beyond these Guṇas, is fit for becoming Brahman

For, I am the base (stability) of Brahman which is immortal and immutable, and of the eternal Dharma, and of the exclusive happiness.' (Gitā 14·26-27)

Although the host of qualities beginning with — having the sins destroyed etc., and ending with having the thoughts fulfilled, is manifested as being natural in the case of the inmost Atman, still that (host of qualities) being only of that nature depends upon the Paramapurusa and its permanent stay is dependent upon him. And as the Paramapuruṣa always desires to have this permanent state (of the guṇagana), this continues to remain permanent — so, there is no contradiction. And in the same way, being the instrument of the enjoyment

भोगोपकरणस्य लीलोपकरणस्य च नित्यतया शास्त्रावगतस्य परमपुरुषस्य नित्येष्टत्वादेव तथावस्थानमस्तीति शास्त्रादवगम्यते। अतो मुक्तस्य सत्यसंकल्पत्वं परमपुरुषसाम्यं च जगद्व्यापारवर्जम् ॥ २० ॥

भोगमात्रसाम्यलिङ्गाच्च ॥ २१ ॥

[552] ब्रह्मयाथात्म्यानुभवरूपभोगमात्रेण मुक्तस्य ब्रह्मसाम्यप्रतिपादनाच्च लिङ्गाज्जगद्व्यापारवर्जमित्यवगम्यते

'सोऽश्नुते सर्वान्कामान्सह ब्रह्मणा विपश्चिता' (तै २।१)

इति। अतो मुक्तस्य परमपुरुषसाम्यं सत्यसंकल्पत्वं च परमपुरुषासाधारणनिखिलजगन्नियमनश्रुत्यानुगुण्येन वर्णनीयमिति जगद्व्यापारवर्जमेव मुक्तैश्वर्यम् ॥ २१ ॥

[553] यदि परमपुरुषायत्तं मुक्तस्यैश्वर्यं तर्हि तस्य स्वतन्त्रत्वेन तत्संकल्पान्मुक्तस्य पुनरावृत्तिसंभवशङ्केत्यत्राह —

अनावृत्तिः शब्दादनावृत्तिः शब्दात् ॥ २२ ॥

यथा निखिलहेयप्रत्यनीककल्याणैकतानो जगज्जन्मादिकारणं समस्तवस्तुविलक्षणः

---

by the Paramapurusa and the instruments created in sport known from the Sāstra as being permanent, are always desired by the Paramapurusa and so they stay on in that way — this is known from the Sāstra Therefore, having the thoughts fulfilled and extreme resemblance with the Paramapurusa in the case of the Released one (exist), barring dealing with the world ॥ 20 ॥

And on account of the characteristic about the resemblance confined only to enjoyment ॥ 21 ॥

[552] And from the characteristic — viz the propounding in the case of the Released one, resemblance with Brahman, confined only to the enjoyment of the form of realisation of Brahman as it is — is apprehended (that the Sāmya is), barring the dealing with the world, as in

'He enjoys all desires along with the wise Brahman (*Tai 2 1*)

Therefore, resemblance with the Paramapurusa, and having the thoughts fulfilled, in the case of the Released one — this is to be described in accordance with the Sruti pointing out to the control of the entire world peculiar to the Paramapurusa — and so the wealth of glory of the Released one is there, *barring only the dealing with the world* ॥ 21 ॥

[553] If the wealth of glory of the Released one is dependent upon the Paramapurusa, then because he (Paramapurusa) is independent, there is the doubt viz the possibility of the Released one returning to the Samsāra, if He thinks that way — So here (the Sūtrakāra) says

Non-return, on account of the Word, non-return, on account of the Word ॥ 22 ॥

Just as it is known from the Word (Sruti) that there is the Paramapurusa called Parabrahman — uniformly auspicious, the rival (opposite)

सर्वज्ञः सत्यसंकल्प आश्रितवात्सल्यैकजलधिः परमकारुणिको निरस्तसमाभ्यधिकसंभावनः परब्रह्माभिधानः परमपुरुषोऽस्तीति शब्दादवगम्यते, एवमहरहरनुष्ठीयमानवर्णाश्रमधर्मानुगृहीत तदुपासनरूपतत्समाराधानप्रीत उपासीनाननादिकालप्रवृत्तानन्तदुस्तरकर्मसंचयरूपाविद्यां विनिवर्त्य, स्वयाथात्म्यानुभवरूपानवधिकातिशयानन्दं प्रापय्य, पुनर्नावर्तयतीत्यपि शब्दादेवावगम्यते । शब्दश्च

'स खल्वेवं वर्तयन्यावदायुषं ब्रह्मलोकमभिसंपद्यते न च पुनरावर्तते'
(छा ८।१५।१)

इत्यादिकः । तथा च भगवता स्वयमेवोक्तम्

'मामुपेत्य पुनर्जन्म दुःखालयमशाश्वतम् ।
नाप्नुवन्ति महात्मानः संसिद्धिं परमां गताः ॥
आब्रह्मभुवनाल्लोकाः पुनरावर्तिनोऽर्जुन ।
मामुपेत्य तु कौन्तेय पुनर्जन्म न विद्यते ॥' (गीता ८।१५–१६)

इति ।

न चोच्छिन्नकर्मबन्धस्यासंकुचितज्ञानस्य परब्रह्मैकानुभवैकस्वभावस्य तदेकप्रियस्यानवधिकातिशयानन्दं ब्रह्मानुभवतोऽन्यापेक्षातदर्थारम्भाद्यसंभवात्पुनरावृत्तिशङ्का । न च

---

of everything fit to be abandoned, the cause of the origination etc, of the world, different from all entities omniscient, with thoughts fulfilled, the one ocean of affection for those resorting (to him), extremely merciful, in whose case the possibility of any one equal or superior is out of question, — similarly it is known from the Word (Sruti) itself, that he does not cause the worshippers to return (to this Samsāra), pleased with the propitiation in the form of his worship fortified by the (proper observance of the) duties of the Varnas and Āśramas performed day after day, having turned away the Avidyā of the form of the heap of Karmans, unlimited and difficult to cross, starting from times immemorial, and having made them attain to excessive bliss of the form of the realisation of himself as he is — And the Word (is)

'He, indeed, acting in this way, as long as he lives, attains to the Brahmaloka and returns not again' (Cha. 8·15·1)

etc And to the same effect, by the Lord himself is stated —

'Having attained to me, the high-souled ones, having secured supreme perfection, do not go in for birth again, the impermanent abode of misery'

'The worlds right up to Brahmaloka, are revolving ones, (O) Arjuna, but on attaining to me, re-birth exists not'
(Gitā 8 15–16)

Not again should there be any fear about his returning again on account of the impossibility of dependence on anything else and working for its sake in the case of the one whose bond of Karman has snapped asunder, whose knowledge knows no contraction, who has the one nature of the realisation of

परमपुरुषः सत्यसंकल्पोऽप्यर्थप्रियं ज्ञानिनं लब्ध्वा कदाचिदावर्तयिष्यति, य एवमाह

'प्रियो हि ज्ञानिनोऽत्यर्थमहं स च मम प्रियः ॥
उदाराः सर्व एवैते ज्ञानी त्वात्मैव मे मतम् ।
आस्थितः स हि युक्तात्मा मामेवानुत्तमां गतिम् ॥
बहूनां जन्मनामन्ते ज्ञानवान्मां प्रपद्यते ।
वासुदेवः सर्वमिति स महात्मा सुदुर्लभः ॥' (गीता ७।१७–१९)

इति । सूत्राभ्यासः शास्त्रपरिसमाप्तिं द्योतयतीति सर्वं समञ्जसम् ॥ २२ ॥

जगद्व्यापारवर्जाधिकरणं समाप्तम् (६)

इति श्रीभगवद्रामानुजाचार्यविरचिते शारीरकमीमांसाभाष्ये चतुर्थाध्यायस्य चतुर्थः पादः समाप्तः ॥

अध्यायश्चतुर्थो ग्रन्थश्च शास्त्रं च परिसमाप्तम् ॥
नमो भगवते रामानुजमुनये योगिवर्याय ॥
नमः पूर्वाचार्येभ्यः ॥

Highest Brahman alone, who alone is dear to it, who realises Brahman which is limitless excessive Ānanda —Not again would the Paramapuruṣa who has his thoughts fulfilled, having secured the knower who is exceedingly dear to him, make him return at any time — (the Paramapuruṣa) who has declared thus —

'For, I am exceedingly dear to him who knows, and he is also (exceedingly) dear to me

All these are good (noble) ones, but the one who knows is my very Ātman,—this is my view; for, he with controlled mind abides in me alone, the highest Destination.

The knower reaches me at the end of many births, (realising) that Vāsudeva (is) everything — such a high-souled one is extremely rare.' (Gītā 7·17–19)

The repetition of the Sūtra indicates the completion of the Śāstra and so everything is proper. ॥ 22 ॥

Here ends the Jagadvyāpāravarjādhikarana (6)

End of the Fourth Quarter of the Fourth Chapter in the Commentary on the Śārīrakamīmāṁsā composed by the Illustrious Revered Preceptor Rāmānuja.

Here ends the Fourth Chapter, the Book and the Śāstra.

Salutation to Rāmānuja-muni, the best of Yogins.

Salutation to the Ācāryas of old.

II. 3

The third Quarter of the Second Adhyāya deals with the origination (and dissolution) of the elements, the non-origination of the Soul his nature freedom of the will etc

[328] The first Adhikarana comprises nine Sūtras (1–9). Pūrvapaksa-Sūtras are 1, 3 and 4, the Siddhanta-Sūtras are 2, 5-9

(Sūtra 1) The Pūrvapaksin says — Ākāśa is not originated, because there is no Sruti to that effect The *Chāndogya* speaks of Tejas being produced from तत् (Brahman), and Ākāśa is not mentioned The Sruti can only state what is possible the *Mundaka* Sruti where Ākāśa is said to be produced should be rejected, as a निरवयव entity cannot possibly be created

[329] (Sūtra 2) The Siddhāntin says—The objector's contention is wrong we have actually the *Mundaka*-passage (एतस्माज्जायते ख वायु) before us the Sruti is not always bound down by any Laukika Pramāna it can certainly take note of some other Sruti and make the necessary adjustment (निरवयवत्वादि-हेतु Anumāna would be वियत् नित्यम्, निरवयवत्वात् परमाणुवत्, वियत्, नित्यम् विभुत्वात् आत्मवत्).

[330–31] (Sūtras 3 and 4) The Purvapaksin again argues — The *Muṇḍaka-passage must not be interpreted literally, but only metaphorically*, as it comes into conflict with the Chāndogya–passage which speaks of Tejas being created first and further Viyat or Ākāśa is described by the Sruti as Amrta

It may be objected by some admirers of the सिद्धान्तिन् that such an interpretation of the Sruti passage एतस्मादात्मन आकाश सम्भूत, वायोरग्नि (सम्भूत) would mean that the same word सम्भूत has to be taken metaphorically with Ākāśa, and understood literally in respect of Vāyu, Tejas etc This is surely strange The answer by the Pūrvapaksin is—This is not an uncommon procedure The same word Brahman is used metaphorically to denote Pradhāna in the *Mundaka*, and primarily to mean Brahman, and this is not objected to by any one.

गौण्यसम्भवात् and शब्दाच्च are read as separate Sūtras by Sankara Bhāskara etc, Nimbārka, Srikaṇṭha, Baladeva etc, follow Rāmānuja

[331 A] (Sūtras 5–9) The Siddhāntin replies— (Sūtra 5) The Srutis mentioning the origination of Ākāsa cannot be dismissed as being metaphorical, for that would mean that the एकविज्ञानेन सर्वविज्ञानम् emphasised in the *Chāndogya* would be futile This declaration can be justified only if everything else including Ākāśa is the product of Brahman

Rāmānuja splits प्रतिज्ञाहानि as प्रतिज्ञा + अहानि Baladeva reads the Sūtra as प्रतिज्ञाहानेर्व्यतिरेकात्

आकाश is definitely said to be ब्रह्मकार्य (as the मृत्पिण्ड illustration shows) the Jīvas are not different from Brahman, because they are ब्रह्मशरीर

(Sūtra 6) The *Chāndogya* also definitely speaks of everything as Brahmakārya, in stating एकमेवाद्वितीयम्, ऐतदात्म्यमिद सर्वम् etc तत्तेजोऽसृजत simply means Brahman created Tejas not that Tejas was the *first* to be created and has no power to nullify other Srutis that speak of Ākasa and Vayu as being created by Brahman before Tejas

Most Bhāsyakāras read 5 and 6 as one Sūtra

(Sūtra 7) Ākasa is a विकार of Brahman and so, it must be a product (विभाग उत्पत्ति) of Brahman

लोकवत् is explained by Rāmānuja as follows —When a general statement is made—here are the sons of Devadatta—and only some of them are actually introduced, it is understood that the remaining also are Devadatta s sons

Other interpretations of लोकवत् are—

यावत्किंचिद्विकारजात दृश्यते तावानेव विभागो लोके दृश्यते । (शङ्कर)

आकाशमपि विकृतम् , लौकिकव्यवहारविषयत्वात् । (वल्लभ)

लोकव्यवहारानुसारेणेत्यथ —यथा लोके दार्वादौ सूक्ष्माग्न्यादेर्निर्मन्थनादिनाभिव्यज्यमानाना विकाराणा मेवोत्पत्तिर्व्यवह्रियते, तथैव सूक्ष्माकाशादभिव्यक्तस्य कार्याकार्यस्यैवोत्पत्ति श्रुतिषु व्यवह्रियते । (विज्ञानभिक्षु)

Baladeva reads the Sūtra as यावद्विकारस्तु

अमृतत्व, as in the case of Gods means only चिरकालावस्थायित्व, when spoken of in connection with Ākāsa Saṅkara also remarks — अमृतत्वश्रुतिस्तावद्वियत्यमृता इव दिवौकसा इतिवद्द्रष्टव्या । ' आकाशवत्सर्वगतश्च नित्य ' इत्यपि प्रसिद्धमहत्त्वेनाकाशेनोपमान क्रियते निरतिशय महत्त्वाय नाकाशसमत्वाय । यथेषुरिव सविता धावतीति क्षिप्रगतित्वायोच्यते नेषुतुल्यगतित्वाय, तद्वत् ।

[332] (Sūtra 8) Sankara takes this Sutra as forming a separate Adhikarana and remarks अतिदेशोऽयम्

योग means सूत्र here Rāmānuja says that this Sūtra is put in to show that Vayu also like Akāśa, is originated, and to give Vāyu his due importance

(मातरिश्वन् — Vayu the *Nirukta* derives the word as मातरि, अन्तरिक्षे श्वसिति मातरि, आशु अनिति वा, मातरि श्वयति वर्धते ।)

If no Sūtra had been there independently referring to Vāyu, in Sutra 10 below the expression अत would mean that Tejas has both Ākāśa and Vāyu as its originators but only Vāyu is the cause of Tejas

(Sūtra 9) Brahman cannot be originated there would be no एकविज्ञानेन सर्वविज्ञानम् , if Brahman itself were to be the कार्य of something else

[333] (Sūtra 10) According to Rāmānuja Sūtras 10–17 form one Adhikarana Sūtras 10–13 (12 and 13 are read as one Sūtra by Saṅkara and others) form the Pūrvapaksa and Sūtra 14 is the Siddhānta According to Sankara Sūtras 10–12 and Sūtras 13–15, each form three separate Adhikaranas

The Pūrvapaksa arises in this way —The origination of the various elements is mentioned Is one to understand that the succeeding entity is produced from the preceding one only, or is it from Brahman itself taking that orm ? The Pūrvapaksin says — the origination is from the केवलतत्तद्वस्तु

(Sūtras 11–12) Tejas comes from Vāyu; waters come from Tejas (Agni), and Prithivī (Anna) from waters.

[334] (Sūtra 13) It might be argued that the *Chāndogya* speaks of Anna as coming from waters; how is it that Anna means Pṛthivī?

The answer is as follows :—

(1) The context (अधिकार) shows that the elements are the subject-matter.

(2) Everything that is fit to be eaten is the विकार of पृथिवी; so there is nothing wrong in referring to the कारण (पृथिवी) by the word (अन्न) denoting the Kārya.

(3) The colour of Agni is red; that of water's is white the colour of Anna is given as dark, so the dark colour must refer to some सजातीय like the Pṛthivī.

(4) Other Śruti-passages actually say अद्भ्यः पृथिवी.

The Sruti says आकाशाद्वायुः and not that Vāyu is produced from Brahman with Ākāśa as its body; so the various elements can be said to come from Brahman परंपरया.

Rāmānuja gives no convincing reason as to why there should be a Pūrvapakṣa at this stage. One should first have a definite statement that the elements are originated, and then the question could have been mooted, whether it is Brahman or Purusa that causes the origination, and the answer could come in Sūtra 14.

[335] (Sūtra 14) The Siddhānta is:— The Paramapurusa is the real originator everywhere. He creates the world by his own Saṁkalpa, as the Śruti tells us. Everything forms his body, and he is the inner Controller.

It is true that the Śruti does not speak directly of Ikṣaṇa in the case of Mahat etc., as it does in the case of Tejas etc., but that does not matter, as Mahat etc., are on a par with Tejas etc., both being the परमपुरुषशरीर.

[336] (Sūtra 15) the objector points out that the passage,

एतस्माज्जायते प्राणो मनः सर्वेन्द्रियाणि च।
खं वायुर्ज्योतिरापः पृथिवी विश्वस्य धारिणी ॥

must be taken to mean that the creation takes place in a particular order.

The answer would be :— The Śruti speaks of two क्रम s — आनन्तर्यक्रम as in the above passage and the परंपरया कारणक्रम as in the series, महत् — अहंकार — आकाश etc. In order to reconcile the Śruti-passages, it should be admitted that the different Kāryas originate from Brahman taking the different forms. It must be remembered also that Ākāśa etc., actually denote Brahman itself which is their Ātman. The objector seems to take एतस्माज्जायते as connected with only Prāṇa, but there is no reason why it should not be connected with Manas and Indriyas as well. Thus the passage does not describe the उत्पत्तिक्रम but only the extent of the jurisdiction of Brahman.

Rāmānuja takes विपर्यय to mean ' difference ', and says that the Sūtra corroborates what the previous Sūtra has stated, and thus the Śruti-passages are properly reconciled.

[Rāmānuja's interpretation is not convincing. Śankara and others understand विपर्यय to mean re-absorption, and explain the Sūtra to mean — the process of re-absorption is appropriately the reverse of that seen in the creation, पृथिवी merges into waters, waters into Tejas etc. Śankara remarks — विपर्ययेण तु प्रलयक्रमोऽत उत्पत्तिक्रमाद्भवितुमर्हति । तथा हि लोके दृश्यते — येन क्रमेण सोपानमारूढस्ततो विपरीतेन क्रमेणावरोहतीति । Why Rāmānuja should have thought it necessary to give his complicated interpretation is not clear. Perhaps he thought the प्रलयक्रम reference was out of order, when उत्पत्तिक्रम was the matter in hand.

(Sūtra 16) The objector again points out that in the second half of the passage एतस्माज्जायते...the correct उत्पत्तिक्रम of the elements is given (ख, वायु, ज्योतिस्, अप् and पृथिवी), it is reasonable therefore to suppose that there is उत्पत्तिक्रम in the first half as well (प्राण, मनस् and इन्द्रियस) and so the Śruti need not be understood as referring to direct origination from Brahman.

The answer is — The Śruti refers to all entities, from प्राण right up to पृथिवी and there could be no discrimination, and the different Sruti-passages have to be reconciled as best as possible.

विज्ञान refers to Indriyas as they are the means of विज्ञान.

Śaṅkara's interpretation of this Sūtra appears to be more natural and convincing. According to him, the question is—Where in the order of origination are to be accommodated Manas (Buddhi) and Indriyas which are definitely mentioned in some Śrutis? In the *Mundaka*, for instance, the Karanas come in between the Ātman and the elements. The Siddhānta is — Actually this need not worry any one much, whatever view about the sense-organs etc., is taken. If they are constituted of the elements, the order is not disturbed (sometimes the elements and sense-organs are mentioned separately but that is to be explained in accordance with the ब्राह्मणपरिव्राजकन्याय—though the परिव्राजक्s are also Brāhmaṇas, their separate mention is intended to draw special attention to them, when one says ब्राह्मणपरिव्राजकान् भोजय); if they are not भौतिक, the order remains undisturbed, whether the Karanas are originated first, or the elements. So, we must understand that in the Mundaka-passage, there is the समाम्नायक्रम (the order for recital) and not the उत्पत्तिक्रम.

[337] (Sūtra 17) Śankara takes this Sūtra as forming a separate Adhikarana.

The Pūrvapaksin says — If all words directly denote Brahman, how can we explain that different words are used by people to denote different entities, both movable and immovable ?

The answer is :—

(A) Really such a reference (व्यपदेश) is भाक्त (एकदेशे भज्यते, इति) or partial, as it refers only to the प्रकार (while Brahman is the प्रकारिन्) prior to the realisation of the Prakārin

(B) Or, if we read अभाक्तः (मुख्यः), then the sense is — The चराचरव्यपाश्रयः primarily points out to Brahman; for, the denotative power of all words is dependent upon Brahman.

Rāmānuja's interpretation is far-fetched and confusing. According to Śaṅkara, the Sūtra refers to the popular ideas about the उत्पत्ति and प्रलय of the Jīva, and points out that उत्पत्ति and प्रलय affect only the स्थावरजङ्गम bodies, and are caused by the connection with, and separation from the body.

[338] (Sūtra 18) The third Adhikaraṇa has only one Sūtra and the point discussed is, whether the Jīva is born (originated).

The objector says — The प्रतिज्ञा in the Śruti, एकविज्ञानेन सर्वविज्ञानम् which is without any reservations, can be true if everything else than Brahman, including the Jīva, is created.

The answer is — The Jīva or Ātman is not created (Rāmānuja reads न, आत्मा श्रुतेः), as the Śruti says न जायते म्रियते, and other Sruti-passages describe him as Nitya which implies अनुत्पन्नत्व. The प्रतिज्ञा — एकविज्ञानेन सर्वविज्ञानम् — can still hold good; Jīva can be said to be a Kārya due to ज्ञानसंकोचविकासः he is not a Kārya involving any change in his nature. Brahman has the Cit and Acit entities as its body. नानात्व and एकत्व are really नामरूपविभागभाव and नामरूपविभागाभाव respectively.

[339] This position is in a sense accepted by the Advaitins as well — The Advaitins regard

(A) the nature of Jīva, as due to Avidyā (but this would mean that Brahman itself is affected by Avidyā).

(B) or, as due to some Upādhi
(but this means that Brahman is affected by the Upādhis).

(C) or that the सन्मात्र Brahman remains three-fold as भोक्तृ (Jiva), भोग्य (the Acit) and नियन्तृ (Parameśvara)
(but thus Brahman becomes subject to modification).

But the views of the Advaitins are thus associated with some blemish or other. Rāmānuja adds that the Viśiṣṭādvaita view is free from blemish; for, Brahman, even in the कारणावस्था and कार्यावस्था (that is, स्थूलसूक्ष्मावस्था, with Cit and Acit as its body) remains the same, possessing all कल्याणगुणs. (Rāmānuja conveniently forgets that the Advaitins would regard the concept of a composite Brahman with Cit and Acit as its body, as the biggest blemish in his system of Viśiṣṭādvaita).

Most Bhāṣyakāras read नात्मा, अश्रुतेः which is certainly a better arrangement. Besides being on a par with the Sūtra न वियत्, अश्रुतेः the force of च (in नित्यत्वाच ताभ्यः) is more properly brought home thereby, the meaning being — Not only is there no Śruti declaring Ātman to be originated, but on the contrary there are scores of Śruti-passages declaring that Ātman is Nitya — thus Ātmasvarūpa is made clear both positively and negatively.

[340] (Sūtra 19) The fourth Adhikaraṇa comprises as many as 14 Sūtras.

Sūtra 19 discusses the nature of Jīva who has been already proved to be non-originated —

(1) Is Jīva Cinmātra (as held by some Bauddhas and Sāṁkhyas) ?

(2) Is Jīva Acitsvarūpa, having Caitanya as an adventitious (Āgantuka) quality (as held by the Vaiśesikas) ?

(3) Is Jīva Jñātṛsvarūpa ?

The Pūrvapakṣin says—Ātman is Cinmātra as the Śruti says यो विज्ञाने तिष्ठन् (A Jñatṛ or knower cannot abide in Jñāna); also विज्ञानं यज्ञं तनुते (here Vijñāna has obviously the nature of the Agent, performing the sacrifice). This means that neither Jñāna nor Jñatṛtva can be the Svarūpa or nature of Ātman, for in that case, these would be perception at all time everywhere. But we see that there is the absence of Jñāna in the Susupti or Mokṣa state (न प्रेत्य संज्ञास्ति says the Śruti). Caitanya must there be only an Āgantuka quality and Ātman is by nature Jada.

[341] The Siddhāntin says :— The Śrutis make it abundantly clear that Ātman is ज्ञातृस्वरूप: e. g. यो वेदेदं जिघ्राणीति स आत्मा,...कामान्पश्यन् रमते, नोपजनं स्मरन्...; विज्ञानमय: (abounding in ज्ञान), द्रष्टा, श्रोता ..विज्ञानात्मा पुरुष: etc.

Śankara explains ज्ञ: as नित्यचैतन्य:, as Jīva is really Brahman itself associated with Upādhis and Brahman is well-known as possessed of Nityacaitanya. In the state of deep sleep, there is not the absence of Caitanya, but only the absence of objects of sense; the sense-organs are useful in bringing out the particular features of the objects; that is all.

Śaṅkara's interpretation of Jña as Jñānasvarūpa is criticised adversely by many. It is pointed out that Jña (जानातीति ज्ञ:) must mean 'a knower' and not 'knowledge'. We think that even the most bitter critic of Śankara would hesitate to question Śaṅkara's acquaintance with Sanskrit Grammar. The Jīva is often described as विज्ञानघन or प्रज्ञाघन by the Śruti, and Śaṅkara in conformity with Śruti describes the nature of Jīva as Jñāna. One who is ज्ञानस्वरूप must have, as a matter of course, the power to know. The state of a knower is conditioned by the presence of objects of knowledge etc, one cannot be a knower in a vacuum. So, Śaṅkara emphasises the ज्ञानस्वरूप here. Philosophically, there is hardly any difference between one who is a knower and one who is ज्ञानस्वरूप.

Śaṅkara and others read this Sūtra as a separate Adhikaraṇa, thus giving it its due importance.

[342] (Sūtra 20) According to Rāmānuja, this and the following Sūtras answer the objection :—If Jīva is a knower by nature, there would be perception by him always everywhere as he is all-pervading.

The Siddhāntin says :—Jīva is not विभु; he is atomic (अणु) in size; for, the Śruti speaks of Jīva's

(A) departure from the body,

(B) movement towards the Moon, and

(C) return to this world.

These movements are not possible in the case of a Vibhu (all-pervading) entity.

(Sūtra 21) Departure from the body can be explained metaphorically as meaning absence of connection with the body, but the other two movements must be understood as being real.

[343] (Sūtra 22) The Sruti sometimes says महानेव अज आत्मा; but the context shows that the reference there is to the Prājña or Paramātman.

अनुवित्त means उपास्य or प्राप्य.

(Sūtra 23) The Śruti actually uses the word अणु (atomic) to describe Jīva, and his dimension (Unmāna — उद्धृत्य मानम्) is spoken of as the edge of an awl or a hundredth part of a hundredth part of a single hair-end.

[344] (Sūtra 24) It may be objected that if Jiva is Aṇu, how can he experience pain as pervading the whole body ? — The answer is — Just as a drop of sandal-oil, although placed on a small part of the body, gives a pleasurable sensation to the whole body, the Jīva although atomic can have a sensation pervading the whole body,

(Sūtra 25) The objector says that the Candana-illustration is faulty, because while the location of the Candana-oil is actually perceived, no location for the atomic Jiva is available. The answer is — The Śruti gives the heart as the local habitation of the Jīva and so the illustration is quite an apt one.

देशविशेष — the vital parts, eye, ear, nose, heart etc.

(Sūtra 26) Rāmānuja takes this Sūtra as propounding the Siddhānta. There does not exist sufficient justification for this. In that case, a new Adhikaraṇa should have been started with the next Sūtra; but Rāmānuja does not do that though he seems to have begun a new topic with the next Sūtra— how can ज्ञान, ज्ञातृगुण be separate from the ज्ञातृ ?

The Jīva pervades the whole body by his Jñānaguṇa, as the gem or the Sun pervades a wide space by the आलोक (lustre)-गुण, although located in one small place.

Saṅkara along with others reads the Sūtra as गुणाद्वा लोकवत् (लोकवत्—as in the world, from the popular point of view, and refers to the [illegible]).

[345] (Sūtra 27) Jñāna can be separate from Jñātṛ as is certified by the Śruti आनान्येवार्थं पुरः । A Guṇa can remain separate from the Guṇin, as for instance, the Kusuma-gandha (the fragrance of the flower) is experienced far apart from the place where the flower is (But is this not due to the Gandha being wafted along with the minute particles of the flower ?)

Sankara and others read तथा च दर्शयति as a separate Sūtra, referring to the passage आ लोमभ्य आ नखाग्रेभ्यः

(Sūtra 28) The Sruti distinctly says that Vijñāna is separate from Vijñātṛ (न हि विज्ञातुर्विज्ञातेर्विपरिलोपो विद्यते). Śaṅkara refers to the Śruti [illegible] विज्ञानमादाय.

There is no material difference about the interpretation of Sūtras 20-28, individually, given by the Bhāṣyakāras The Sūtrakāra makes use of three analogies, चन्दनवत्, आलोक (or लोक) वत् and गन्धवत् But the most important or vital difference is that Sankara takes all these Sūtras as giving the view of the Pūrvapaksin (Sūtra 29 gives the Siddhānta view) According to Rāmānuja the whole discussion centres on the problem — how can one avoid the contingency of सर्वत्रोपलब्धि if the Jiva is all-pervading and not atomic ? This does not appear to be natural as the question about उपलब्धि and अनुपलब्धि is premature here and is discussed separately in Sūtra 32.

Saṅkara's comments are more to the point After describing the nature of the Jīva, the Sūtrakāra turns to the question about the dimension of the Jiva Now the dimension of the Jiva can be one of the three — (१) अणु (२) देहपरिमाण, and (३) विभु देहपरिमाण is out of question as it cannot exist in a नित्य entity Jiva is admitted to be नित्य by all (Besides, that view has already been refuted, when the Jaina doctrine was discussed in II 2 32-34) The Pūrvapaksin favours the अणुपरिमाण according to Saṅkara It is true that the Pūrvapaksa becomes a long one in that case, and is given great importance But this is not a strong argument to question Saṅkara's arrangement, possibly the Sūtrakāra wants to give as long a rope as possible to the Pūrvapaksin to secure greater glory for the Siddhāntin

[346] *(Sūtra 29) This is a very important Sūtra Rāmānuja* understands the Sūtra as answering the query—How is it that the Ātman is designated as Jñāna (विज्ञान यज्ञ तनुते), although he is the knower (ज्ञातृ) ?

तत्-विज्ञान विज्ञानगुणसारत्वादात्मनो विज्ञानव्यपदेश is the answer प्राज्ञवत्—As Prājña is designated Ānanda, as Ānanda is his सारभूत-गुण Rāmānuja connects this discussion with the Sūtra ज्ञोऽत एव which stands at the beginning of this Adhikarana (ज्ञोऽत एव as has been already remarked, is taken as forming a separate Adhikarana by many)

It would be seen that तत् is used twice in the Sūtra (तद्गुण and तद्व्यपदेश) It is reasonable to hold that तत् must mean the same thing in both places, and तत् must also have been referred to before The interpretations by the various Bhāsyakāras would have to be judged accordingly —

(1) Sankara — तस्या, बुद्धेर्गुणा सार प्रधान यस्यात्मन संसारित्वे सभवति स तद्गुणसार, तस्य भाव बुद्धिपरिमाणेन, अस्य परिमाण (अणुत्वादि) व्यपदेश । that is (Saṅkara takes the first तत् to refer to बुद्धि and the second तत् to अणुत्व) There is apparent discrepancy here Saṅkara could have stopped at explaining the first तत् as अणुत्व but he chooses to give the additional information that अणुत्व is specially associated with Buddhi which is often spoken of as extremely subtle (सूक्ष्म)

(2) Bhāskara on the whole follows Saṅkara

(3) Nimbārka — विभुत्वगुणत्वान्नित्य विभुमिति व्यपदिष्ट (that is, the point at issue is — If Ātman is अणु why is he called विभु, नित्य etc ?

(4) Srikantha — ज्ञानगुणसारत्वादात्मनो ज्ञानव्यपदेश ।

(5) Vijñānabhikṣu :— उपाधिभूतादणुगुणसारत्वात्तु, अणुगुणव्यपदेशो जीवे (this is practically the same as Śaṅkara's) यथा प्राज्ञ ईश्वरे मायापरमाण्वाद्युपाधिगुणसारत्वेन मायादिगुण-व्यपदेशः ।

(6) Vallabha :-तस्य ब्रह्मणो गुणाः प्रज्ञाद्युत्वादयस्त एवात्र जीवे सारा इति जीवे भगवद्व्यपदेशः ।

That अणुत्व of the Jīva is the matter in hand here is most probable. Interpretations of तद्व्यपदेश as विभु-ज्ञान-भगवद्-व्यपदेश, are not therefore acceptable.

Vijñānabhikṣu's interpretation is the best, as he explicitly takes both the तत् words to mean Aṇu. Śaṅkara means the same thing, but he does not make it explicit in so many words that बुद्धिगुण is the same as अणुगुण.

Another important point which seems to have been missed is that the Sūtrakāra uses the expression तद्व्यपदेशः (that designation or designation by that); that is to say, that the Jīva is *called or designated* अणु, not that he *is* अणु. This definitely corroborates Śaṅkara's position. व्यपदेश does not refer to the actual Svarūpa or nature of a thing, but something metaphorical. Rome is called 'The Eternal city' but is not eternal; the Lord is often called 'Father and mother' which cannot be understood literally.

प्राज्ञवत् — This illustration is not to be understood in the ordinary sense of a Dṛṣṭānta. The Sūtrakāra wants simply to point out that the Paramātman also, like the Jīva, is designated in various ways (Ānanda, Vijñāna etc.).

[347] (Sūtra 30) There is no harm in describing Jīva as Vijñāna, as it is a life-long attribute of the Jīva, just as गोत्व is the special (स्वरूपनिरूपणधर्म) attribute of a bull, persisting as long as the गो exists. Rāmānuja adds, चकारादात्मनोऽपि स्वप्रकाशत्वेन ज्ञानमिति व्यपदेशो 'न दोष' इति समुच्चिनोति. Jñāna and Ātman, both are स्वप्रकाश, so, Ātman can be designated as Jñāna. Rāmānuja here does not take तद्दर्शनात् as referring to any Śruti-passage. दर्शन usually refers to some Śruti.

Śaṅkara understands योऽयं विज्ञानमयः, etc., as referred to by तद्दर्शनात्, and remarks यावदयमात्मा संसारी भवति. यावदस्य सम्यग्दर्शनेन संसारित्वं न निवर्तते तावदस्य बुद्ध्या संयोगो न शाम्यति ।

Nimbārka — जीवस्य गुणनिबन्धनो विभुत्वव्यपदेशो न विरुद्धः 'न हि विज्ञातुर्विज्ञातेर्विपरिलोपो दृश्यते' इति तद्दर्शनात् ।

Vijñānabhikṣu — उपाधेरन्तःकरणस्य यावदात्मावस्थितयवस्थानात्, नित्यत्वादिति यावत् । तद्दर्शनात्...कर्माणि विज्ञानमयश्च, आत्मा इत्यादिभिरित्यर्थः ।

(Sūtra 31) The objector says — How is it that there is the absence of Jñāna in the state of deep sleep etc.? The answer is that Jñāna is there latent or dormant, just as the virile power is latent in a child, but is manifested only in youth. Expressions like न प्रेत्य संज्ञास्ति do not speak of the absence of Jñāna in the Released, but only that of जन्मनाशादिदर्शन.

The seven Dhātus are :— त्वक्, असृक्, मांस, मेदस्, अस्थि, मज्जा and धातु.

The three Malas are :— वात, पित्त and कफ.

[348] (Sūtra 32) If Ātman is only Jñāna and Sarvagata (all-pervading), the following blemishes are inevitable :—

(1) There would be always Upalabdhi and Anupalabdhi.

(2) There would be only Upalabdhi, or only Anupalabdhi.

(3) Even if Upalabdhi and Anupalabdhi are admitted to be dependent on the Karaṇas (sense-organs), as the Ātman is Sarvagata, he would always be connected with the sense-organs, and the above blemishes would still be there.

Śaṅkara :— Antaḥkaraṇa must be admitted to be the Upādhi of Ātman to avoid Nityopalabdhi and Nityānupalabdhi —

अन्यतरस्य, आत्मनः, इन्द्रियस्य वा शक्तिप्रतिबन्धोऽभ्युपगन्तव्यः ।

Bhāskara :— अन्यथा, आत्मेन्द्रियविषयाणां संनिधौ नित्योपलब्धिः स्यात्, नित्यं चानुपलब्धिप्रसङ्ग अन्यतरनियमो वा ...

Nimbārka :— सर्वगतात्मवादे...बन्धमोक्षयोर्नित्यं प्रसङ्गः स्यात, नित्यबद्धो वा नित्यमुक्तो वात्मा, इत्यन्यतरनियमो वा स्यात्।

[349] (Sūtra 33) The fifth Adhikaraṇa comprises eight Sūtras (Śaṅkara takes Sūtra 40, यथा च तक्षोभयथा, as constituting a separate Adhikaraṇa).

The question discussed is :— To whom does the Kartṛtva belong — to the Jīva, or to the Guṇas (as held by the Sāṅkhyas who regard the Puruṣa as a non-doer) ?

The Pūrvapakṣin says :— The Kartṛtva does not belong to the Jīva; the *Katha* expressly says नायं हन्ति न हन्यते. The *Gītā* says that Kartṛtva belongs to the Prakṛti, and Bhoktṛtva to the Puruṣa.

The Siddhānta is—The Śāstric injunctions यजेत स्वर्गकामः etc., obviously refer to the Jīva, who being Cetana is in a position to act according to the dictates of the Śāstra. The Acetana Prakṛti or the Guṇas cannot do this. The *Gītā* simply wants to say that the Kartṛtva of the Jīva is not due to the nature of the Jīva, but due to the association of the Guṇas and is also dependent upon the permission of the Paramātman.

(Sūtra 34) Śaṅkara and others read this Sūtra as two Sūtras विहारोपदेशात् and उपादानाच्च ।

The *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* tells us that the Jīva catching hold of the Prāṇas sports on in the body at will.

(Sūtra 35) In the passage विज्ञानं यज्ञं तनुते, विज्ञान cannot mean Buddhi or Antaḥkaraṇa which is but a Karaṇa (instrument); if that was the sense, the expression विज्ञानेन (not विज्ञानम्) would have been used. विज्ञान here means Jīva.

Madhva :— आत्मानमेव लोकमुपासीतेति क्रियायां व्यपदेशाच्च, अन्यथा तेनैव लोकमिति व्यपदेशः स्यात् ।

Vijñānabhikṣu :— 'मनसा संकल्पयति' इत्यादिषु शब्देनैव क्रियायां कर्तृत्वव्यपदेशाच्च, न चेज्जीवः कर्ता किं त्वीश्वरस्य करणमेव सः, तदा संकल्पत इत्यादिरूपो निर्देशस्य विपर्यय एव स्यात्, युज्येतेत्यर्थः ।

(Sūtra 36) If Prakṛti were the doer or Agent (Kartṛ) and not the Ātman, all Karmans would be enjoyable by all Ātmans, as Prakṛti is common to all, or, no one would enjoy anything as was pointed out in the

case of Ātman (if Ātman were सर्वगत, there would be नित्योपलब्धिः and नित्यानुपलब्धिः) in Sūtra 32 above. There would be no Niyama in the case of Antaḥkaraṇa etc., as well.

Śaṅkara :— यथायमात्मोपलब्धिं प्रति स्वतन्त्रोऽप्यनियमेनेष्टमनिष्टं चोपलभते, एवमनियमेनैवेष्टमनिष्टं च संपादयिष्यति ।

Madhva :— यथा ज्ञाने, इदं ज्ञास्यामीत्यनियमः प्रतीयते, एवं कर्मण्यपि जीवस्य ।

Śrīkara :— यथा पण्डितस्य शिष्यसांनिध्याभावे तद्विषयप्रवचनीयकर्तृत्वशक्तिसंकोचवत् तथा जीवस्य स्वान्तःकरणादिसमायोगेन सर्वकर्तृत्वम् । सर्वकालकर्तृत्वनियमो न संभवति ।

Vijñānabhikṣu :— तस्य च कर्तृत्वस्योपलब्धिवन्नियमो नास्ति । यथा जीवस्याग्न्यौष्ण्यवच्चैतन्यं नियतं यावद्द्रव्यभावि नैवं कर्तृत्वं भवतीत्यर्थः ।

(Sūtra 37) If Buddhi is the agent, it would have to be the enjoyer as well, which means that Ātman would no longer possess his भोक्तृत्वशक्ति.

Nimbārka — बुद्धेः कर्तृत्वे करणशक्तिर्हीयेत, कर्तृशक्तिः स्यात्, अतो जीवः कर्ता ।

Vijñānabhikṣu — आत्मव्रातजडीकृतस्य गमनादिशक्तिविपर्ययात्, सामर्थ्यस्याप्यभावात् ।

(Sūtra 38) Samādhi is recommended as means to secure Mokṣa; if Buddhi were the agent, it could not possibly have the knowledge in the Samādhi state, in the form 'I am different from the Prakṛti.' Only Ātman can be the agent (Kartṛ) therefore.

Vijñānabhiksu — आत्मनो नित्यकर्तृत्वे समाधेर्व्यापारोपरमस्याभावप्रसङ्गाच्च न नियम इत्यर्थः ।

(Sūtra 39) Just as a carpenter, although in possession of the tools of his trade, works or works not, according to his will, so the Ātman is engaged in activity according to his will — This disposes of the contention that if Atman is Kartṛ, his Kartṛtva would be constant.

This is an important Sūtra and Śaṅkara gives it the status of an Adhikaraṇa. According to Śaṅkara, this Sūtra shows the Kartṛtva of the Jiva in its proper perspective. कर्तृत्व depends upon the Upādhis superimposed upon the Ātman in the Vyavahārāvasthā. The activity of a carpenter depends upon his being possessed of his tools and his pleasure or pain depends upon how far he identifies himself with his tools. Śankara takes च to mean 'but', and comments on the Sūtra as follows — तुर्थे चार्थं चः पठितः । यथा तु तक्षा लोके वास्यादिकरणहस्तो दुःखी भवति, विमुक्तवास्यादिकरणः सुखी भवति, एवमविद्याप्रत्युपस्थापितद्वैतसंपृक्त आत्मा दुःखी भवति, परं ब्रह्म प्रविश्य सुखी भवति ।

Bhāskara — यथा च तक्षा वास्यादिकरणयुक्तः कर्ता तद्विमुक्तश्चाकर्तेति ।

Nimbārka — आत्मेच्छया यथा तक्षा करोति, न करोति, इत्युभयथा व्यवस्था सिध्यति, बुद्धेः कर्तृत्वे, इच्छाभावाद् व्यवस्थाभावः ।

Vallabha — कर्तृभोक्तृत्वयोर्भेदो भविष्यतीति चेत्, न । यथा तक्षा रथं निर्माय तन्नारूढो विहरति पीठं वा । स्वतो वा न व्याप्रियते वास्यादिद्वारेण वा ।

Vijñānabhikṣu — यथैकरूप एव तक्षा वास्याद्युत्कर्षादिमदुपाधिवशात्, स्वतस्तु परमार्थतस्तद्रहितः, इत्युभयथा भवति, एवं जीवो बुद्धिकर्तृत्वादेवोपाधिवशात् कर्ता ।

[350] (Sūtra 40) The sixth Adhikaraṇa comprises two Sūtras.

The Śruti-passages make it quite clear that the Kartṛtva (or the freedom of the will) of the Jīva is under the direction of the Paramātman who is the Antaryāmin staying in the heart of the Jīva.

[351] (Sūtra 41) The Paramātman makes the Jiva act, not arbitrarily, but in accordance with the effort put forth by the Jiva himself The Paramātman creates in the Jiva interest in certain acts, according to the deserts of the Jiva who alone enjoys the fruit of his Karman

The case of the Jiva is similar to that of A and B who are the joint owners of some property A with the consent of B presents a portion of the property to the king who rewards him duly. Though B s consent plays an important part in the transaction, it is A alone who enjoys the reward

वैयर्थ्यादि — By आदि, Rāmānuja understands अनुग्रह, निग्रह etc

Vijñānabhiksu — अनिर्मोक्षादिप्रसङ्गादय ।

[352] The seventh Adhikarana comprises eleven Sūtras and brings the third Quarter to a close

(Sūtra 42) According to Ramānuja, the question is —

(1) Is the Jiva quite different from the Highest Brahman (because the Sruti speaks of Bheda between Jiva and Brahman the Sruti-passages speaking of Abheda can be explained metaphorically) ?

(2) Is Jiva Brahman itself under illusion (because तत्त्वमसि etc , definitely show that the Jiva really has Brahman as his Ātman the नानात्वश्रुतिः only describe not the real state of things, but what is known from the Pratyaksa etc ,) ?

(3) Is Jiva Brahman associated with the Upādhis (because the arrangement about Bandha and Moksa in the case of the Jiva can be properly explained only if the Upādhis come into the picture) ?

(4) Is Jiva a portion of Brahman ?

[353] The Siddhānta is — Jiva is a portion of Brahman

Jiva is described as both identical with and different from Brahman, some recensions actually describe Brahman as being Dāśa, Kitava etc , (that is, pervading all Jivas)

It is absurd to talk of Nānātva - Srutis as referring to what is popularly known from the Pramanas, Pratyksa etc

It is more absurd to speak of Brahman as Bhrānta (subject to illusion), when the Sruti actually describes the sentient Brahman as creating the world by its Samkalpa and controlling the Jiva as the inner Controller

Jiva cannot be Brahman associated with the Upādhis either, for, in that case the description of Brahman as the Niyantr, and Jiva as the Niyāmya would be meaningless

So, we must admit Jiva to be a portion of Brahman to account for both Ekatva and Nānātva

Sankara explains अश as अश इवाशो न हि निरवयवस्य मुख्योऽश सभवति । Sankara is naturally criticised for taking अश to mean अश इव Rāmānuja also quietly takes अश to mean विशेषणाश It appears that the Sūtrakāra finding it impossible to reconcile the two opposite views Ekatva and Nānātva actually mentioned in the Sruti makes no attempt to reconcile them (as in the case of the

Sūtra श्रुतेस्तु शब्दमूलत्वात् II. 1·27). The Sūtrakāra does not say अंश इव, nor does he say that Brahman has Jīva for its शरीर. Both Rāmānuja and Saṅkara try to point out to a solution out of the difficulty.

[354] (Sūtra 43) The Mantra पादोऽस्य विश्वा भूतानि confirms that Jīva is an अंश (पाद् means अंश, the singular number अंशः is जात्यभिप्रायम्, that is, it means 'portions' also, as the Jīvas are many).

Śaṅkara reads the Sūtra as मन्त्रवर्णाच्च.

(Sūtra 44) The *Gītā* says the same thing (ममैवांशो...).

Śaṅkara reads the Sūtra as अपि च स्मर्यते.

Vijñānabhikṣu understands by स्मर्यते 'एकः शुद्धोऽक्षरो नित्यः' इति विष्णुपुराणगीतामोक्षधर्मादिष्वित्यर्थः।

[355] (Sūtra 45) Saṅkara reads the Sūtra as प्रकाशादिवन्नैवं परः, that is, without तु.

If it is pointed out that if Jīva is a portion of Brahman, the blemishes of the Jīva would affect Brahman as well—the answer is:—The Highest Brahman cannot be so affected; for, in the case of two entities involving विशेष्यविशेषणभाव (same as अंशित्व-अंश) स्वभाववैलक्षण्य is actually seen. It appears that Rāmānuja takes the प्रकाशादि illustration as proving that Jīva is a portion of Brahman, like प्रकाश, of Agni, the Sun etc., or गोत्व, of गोव्यक्ति; or the body, of the one possessed of a body. (But this has already been proved in Sūtra 42) नैवं परः is explained as यथाभूतो जीवो न तथाभूतः परः — Jīva and Para are not affected in the same way; but immediately in the next sentence, Rāmānuja again refers to the Para (Aṁśin) as being different from Jīva (Aṁśa) making use of the Prabhā-illustration (just as Prabhā is different from the entity possessing Prabhā) All this unnecessarily has led to the absence of clarity. Other Bhāṣyakāras give a more natural interpretation which is easy to understand:—

Saṅkara :— यथा जीवः संस्कारदुःखमनुभवति, नैवं पर ईश्वरोऽनुभवतीति...प्रकाशादिवदिति निदर्शनोपन्यासः। यथा प्रकाशः सौरश्चान्द्रमसो वा वियद्व्याप्यावतिष्ठमानोऽङ्गुल्याद्युपाधिसंबन्धात्, तेष्वृजुवक्रादिभावं प्रतिपद्यमानेषु तत्तद्भावमिव प्रतिपद्यमानोऽपि न परमार्थतस्तद्भावं प्रतिपद्यते। (Saṅkara also explains the आदि in प्रकाशादि as referring to the घटाकाश and सूर्यप्रतिबिम्ब illustrations).

Nimbārka :— जीवस्य परमपुरुषांशत्वे, अंशी सुखदुःखं नानुभवति यथा प्रकाशादिः स्वांशगतगुणदोषवर्जितो भवति।

Srīkara :— प्रकाशविशिष्टानां मणिप्रभृतीनां प्रकाशो विशिष्टैकदेशो यथांशस्तद्वत्। आदिशब्दाद्विशेषविशेषणैकस्वभावा जातिगुणादयो गृह्यन्ते।

Vijñānabhikṣu :— अंशित्वेऽपि परः कारणं ब्रह्म जीववन्न भवति। प्रकाशादिवत्। यथा प्रकाशालोक आकाशवाय्वाद्यश्चांशिनः, चक्षुःश्रोत्रत्वगादीनां स्वांशानामुपघातादिदोषवत्त्वेऽपि नोपहताः कदापि भवन्ति, तथैवेत्यर्थः।

(Sūtra 46) Parāśara and others, in the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* etc., speak of the अंशांशिभाव of Jagat and Brahman, so also the Śruti passages. Why Rāmānuja refers to the Viṣṇupurāṇa-passages which speak of the अंशांशिभाव of Brahman and Jagat, when the discussion in this Adhikaraṇa centres round the relation of Brahman and Jīva, is not clear.

Saṅkara, Bhāskara and Vijñānabhikṣu say — स्मरन्ति च व्यासादयः।

[356] (Sūtra 47) If the objection is raised — if all the Jivas are equally portions of Brahman, why do the Sāstras enjoin different duties for different castes ? — the answer is — The injunctions and prohibitory regulations concern the bodies of the Jivas though Agni is the same everywhere, the fire from the fire-sanctuary is to be regarded as sacred, not the fire from the cemetery food is permitted to be taken only from a Brāhmana well-versed in the Vedas, not from one who is notorious for his bad behaviour

अभिशस्तृ — One who commits adultery.

Sankara —'ऋतौ भार्यामुपेयात्'इत्यनुज्ञा। 'गुर्वङ्गना नोपगच्छेत्' इति परिहार। यथा ज्योतिष एकत्वेऽपि अग्नि क्रव्यात् परिह्रियते, नेतर। यथा च प्रकाश एकस्यापि सवितुरमेध्यदेशसंबद्ध परिह्रियते, नेतर शुचिभूमिष्ठ। यथा भौमा प्रदेशा वज्रवैडूर्यादय उपादीयन्ते, भौमा अपि सन्तो नरकलेबरादय परिह्रियन्ते। यथा मूत्रपुरीषे गवां पवित्रतया परिगृह्यते, तदेव जात्यन्तरे परिवर्ज्यते, तद्वत्।

(Sūtra 48) असंतति — The state of not being all-pervading, that is, अणुत्व व्यतिकर — भोगव्यतिकर.

Even though all Jivas are a portion of Brahman, there would not be any confusion about the enjoyment on their part as the Jivas are atomic and mutually different

Sankara takes असतति to mean — there is no contact of the Ātman with all the bodies, as the Jiva is restricted in his function by the Upādhis, so no कर्मव्यतिकर or फलव्यतिकर is possible

Vijñānabhiksu — अव्यतिकर, असङ्ग इत्यर्थ। सतति कार्य विकार इति, अविकारित्वादित्यर्थ।

[357] (Sūtra 49) Bhāskara reads the Sūtra as आभासा एव वा (Rāmānuja also takes cognisance of this reading) According to Rāmānuja आभास means हेत्वाभास

If the objector argues that the भोगव्यवस्था can also be explained as being due to the Upādhis, the answer is — The syllogism अखण्डैकरसप्रकाशमात्रस्वरूपे ब्रह्मणि जीवभोगव्यवस्थोपपद्यते, स्वरूपतिरोधानपूर्वकोपाधिसत्त्वात्। which might be put forth by the objector to prove his contention, is obviously fallacious It has been pointed out before that the प्रकाशस्वरूपतिरोधान is nothing but प्रकाशनाश itself Besides, there is श्रुतिविरोध as well

Even if the Upādhis are regarded as unreal, so long as the nature of Brahman screened by the Upādhis is regarded as the same, the भोगव्यतिकर is bound to persist

[358] (Sūtra 50) The objector says — I regard the Upādhis as real, and hold that the भोगाभोगव्यवस्था is due to the beginningless Adrsta or 'Unseen'

The answer is—This does not improve the objector's position for, the Adrsta, like the Upādhis, cannot affect the real nature of Brahman and the Aniyama would still be there.

(Sūtra 51) Meditation etc, which are the cause of Adrsta are also unhelpful in accounting for the भोगाभोगव्यवस्था for the same reason as above

[359] (Sūtra 52) If it be argued that the भोगव्यवस्था is possible, because the Upādhis can affect the various portions (Pradeśas) in one and the same Brahman, the answer is—The Vyatikara cannot be prevented in

that way; for, all the Pradeśas are actually included in the Upādhis; everything is Brahmapradeśa, and this would make Brahman experience grief connected with the Pradeśa.

Rāmānuja adds that the Sūtras आभास एव च etc., point out to the blemishes in the doctrine of the आत्मैकत्ववादिन्s who believe in the Vedas; while the Sūtras नित्योपलब्धि...(II. 3. 32), उपलब्धिवदनियमः (II·3 36) refer to the blemishes in the doctrine of the सर्वगतजीववादिन्s who do not admit the authority of the Vedas.

The important Sūtra in this Adhikaraṇa is undoubtedly आभास एव च.

Rāmānuja, Nimbārka and Śrīkaṇtha take Ābhāsa to mean Hetvābhāsa. Vijñānabhikṣu gives two interpretations—प्रकृत आत्मा जीवो हेत्वाभास इवेत्यर्थः । अथवा, स च जीवो ब्रह्मवदाभासमानः प्रकाशमात्रचिन्मात्र एवेत्यर्थः । Vallabha—आभास एव जीव, आनन्दांशस्य तिरोहितत्वात् ।

The interpretation of Ābhāsa as Hetvābhāsa can safely be rejected. Ābhāsa means usually 'appearance', 'reflection' and that meaning certainly suits the context. Vijñānabhikṣu's second interpretation (ब्रह्मवदाभासमानः प्रकाशमात्रः) is also worth considering. This Sūtra apparently gives the considered opinion of the Sūtrakāra that the Jīva is Ābhāsa, which more or less corroborates Śaṅkara's view. The Sūtrakāra has implicit faith in the Śruti and does not attempt to explain away the contradictions, as the Bhāsyakāras do.

This Quarter deals at length with the question of the size of the Soul. Rāmānuja believes in the plurality of Souls and regards them as atomic in size. The Sūtra तद्गुणसारत्वात्तु तद्व्यपदेशः (II. 3. 29), however, cannot be taken as supporting Rāmānuja as Aṇu is said to be the *Vyapadeśa* of the Soul. There is not much of a difference of opinion among the Bhāṣyakāras, about the freedom of the will, the enjoyment of the fruit of the Karmans etc. But one cannot resist the impression that Śaṅkara's interpretation of the Sūtras as a whole is, by and large, the only one that explains the Śruti-passages satisfactorily.

II. 4

This Quarter deals with the origination of sense-organs and Prāṇa.

The first Adhikaraṇa comprises three Sūtras. Śaṅkara and Nimbārka read the second Sūtra as two Sūtras; Madhva adds one more Sūtra प्रतिज्ञानुपरोधाच्च before Sūtra 3, and makes three Adhikaraṇas out of the Sūtras.

[360] (Sūtra 1) The Pūrvapakṣin says :— तथा refers to जीव-यथा जीवो नोत्पद्यते, तथा प्राणाः (इन्द्रियाणि) नोत्पद्यन्ते. The Śruti says — प्राणा वाव ऋषयः which means that these Ṛsis existed prior to the creation of the world.

The Siddhānta is — तथा must refer to वियदादि, and the meaning is — Just as Ākāśa etc., are originated, so are the sense-organs, because only Ātman was there prior to creation.

The word Prāṇa often means Paramātman and the word Ṛṣi also appropriately gives the sense, the Omniscient.

[361] (Sūtra 2) The plural number प्राणाः, ऋषयः, must be understood as just metaphorical, or indicates respect (आदरार्थे).

(Sūtra 3) An additional reason to prove that the word Prāṇa denotes the Paramātman is that नामधेय etc., the province of वाक् etc , are spoken of as being there before the creation of Ākāśa etc.

The first Sūtra तथा प्राणाः raises an important issue—तथा presupposes some thing यथा, some Upamāna. As Śaṅkara rightly points out, the preceding Sūtras (in II. 3) refer to संगतात्‌ बहुत्वादिदूषण which can not be the Upamāna, as there is no सादृश्य; Adṛṣṭa can not be the Upamāna either, as once देहानियम is pointed out, there is no point in referring to Adṛṣṭa again. Jiva can not be the Upamāna, as Jīva is unborn, and here the Prāṇas are obviously to be described as originated. Śaṅkara therefore suggests that the Upamāna should be sought after in some Dṛṣṭānta in the Śruti (एतस्मादात्मनः सर्वे प्राणाः सर्वे लोकाः सर्वे देवाः सर्वाणि भूतानि व्युच्चरन्ति), the sense being—Just as the different Lokas etc., are originated from the Highest Brahman, so also are originated the Prāṇas. Or, it is permitted (Jaimini III. 4 15 पानव्यापच्च तद्वत्) that an Upamāna far away (व्यवहित) can be made use of So here, the Viyat etc., mentioned at the beginning of the last Quarter could be taken as the Upamāna intended—

It appears that all the Sūtras here should have come immediately after Sūtra 15 in the last Quarter, so as to bring all the originated entities together. In that case, the whole discussion about the Soul, his size etc., could be relegated to this Quarter; or, we may suppose that the points regarding the Soul are stated *inter alia* or by way of parenthesis (this, however, would make those points rather unimportant). Apparently the Bhāṣyakāras dared not to question the arrangement of the Sūtras by the Sūtrakāra, and discuss the matter in conformity with the maxim स्थितस्य गतिश्चिन्तनीया.

Vallabha, curiously enough, holds that the Prāṇas are unborn like the Jivas; the Prāṇas are just like the Jivas, only lacking in the चिदंश; they have the Utkrānti literally and do exist prior to creation. Vallabha stands alone among the Bhāsyakāras, to give this interpretation.

Rāmānuja takes गौण्यसंभवात्, as गौणी, असंभवात्; Śaṅkara dissolves the expression as गौण्याः, असंभवात् and remarks:—वियदधिकरणे हि 'गौण्यसंभवात्' इति पूर्वपक्षसूत्रत्वात्, गौणी जन्मश्रुतिरसंभवादिति व्याख्यातम्। प्रतिज्ञाहान्या च तत्र सिद्धान्तोऽभिहितः। इह तु सिद्धान्तसूत्रत्वात्, गौण्या जन्मश्रुतेरसंभवादिति व्याख्यातम्। तदनुरोधेन त्विहापि गौणी जन्मश्रुतिरसंभवादिति व्याचक्षाणैः प्रतिज्ञाहानिरुपेक्षिता स्यात्।

Rāmānuja sticks to the interpretation rejected by Śaṅkara, and refers the असंभव to बह्वर्थ, which is not convincing.

[362] (Sūtra 4) The second Adhikaraṇa comprises two Sūtras.

The question discussed is :—How many Prāṇas (Indriyas) are there ?

The Pūrvapakṣin says—The Prāṇas are seven in number, because only seven are said to be moving out etc., and they are particularly specified in the Śruti (5 Jñānendriyas, and Manas and Buddhi).

Some take Prāṇas to be eight (अष्टौ ग्रहाः, hand being added to the above seven; they are called ग्रह्s, because they grasp the objects); some take them to be nine (7 associated with the head — 2 eyes, 2 ears, 2 nostrils and 1 mouth;)

and two more, Pāyu and Upastha that are lower down, the organ of evacuation and the organ of generation.)

[363] (Sūtra 5) The Siddhāntin's view is — The Prāṇas are eleven. Both hands and feet, being the instruments of enjoyment (Bhogopakaraṇa), must be included. Manas itself is described in some places as Buddhi, Ahaṁkāra and Citta, and Ātman as Manas. In the Smṛtis also 5 Karmendriyas + 5 Jñānendriyas + Manas — eleven Indriyas are described.

Nābhi is mentioned separately by some, and some would like the number to be fourteen. There is general agreement about the number eleven; any higher number can be explained away as referring to Kāryabheda or Vṛttibheda.

Śaṅkara understands गति to mean both अवगति and movement, and remarks कार्यजातवशात्, त्वेकादशत्वात्प्रानं प्राणनियपं प्रमाणमिति स्थितम्।... तस्मात्, एकादशैव प्राणाः शब्दतः कार्यतश्चेति सिद्धम्।

[364] (Sūtra 6) The third Adhikaraṇa contains two Sūtras.

The Prānas are atomic in size, as they are not perceptible and are capable of movement, Utkrānti etc. they are no doubt called Ananta, but Ānantya in their case does not mean Vibhutva or being all-pervading, but refers to their Kāryabāhulya or manifold activity.

Śaṅkara takes this Sūtra as forming an Adhikaraṇa by itself.

(Sūtra 7) The Chief Prāṇa referred to in the passage आनीत्, अवातं etc., is originated as there is no passage condemning its origination. The passage आनीत्...refers to the Paramātman as the expression अवातं (which shows that the state of things described is one existing before the Vāta, one of the Mahābhūatas, was created) points out.

[365] (Sūtra 8) The fourth Adhikaraṇa comprises four Sūtras.

The question is—Is the Chief Prāṇa

(1) the second Mahābhūta Vāyu, or

(2) merely the Spandakriyā, or

(3) Vāyu in a particular state ?

The Pūrvapakṣin says—The Chief Prāṇa is Vāyu, as the passage यः प्राणः स वायुः *mentions that fact in so many words; or the Chief Prāṇa may be just the* Vāyukriyā, as the Prāṇa is more widely known for some Kriyā, expiration etc.

The Siddhāntin says—Both the above views are wrong. The Śruti describes Prāṇa as distinct from Vāyu, and Vāyukriyā cannot be regarded as separate from Vāyu. Prāṇa denotes a substance possessed of Kriyā, not merely Kriyā.

[366] (Sūtra 9) The Chief Prāṇa is just an Upakaraṇa of the Jīva, like the eye etc., this is obvious from the fact that the Prāṇa is mentioned in the Śruti along with the eye etc. It is well known that only Sajātīya entities are mentioned together.

[367] (Sūtra 10) The objector says —If the Prāṇa is an Upakaraṇa, you must point out the particular activity or help for which Prāṇa is responsible. This you cannot do.

The Siddhāntin's reply is — It is true that the Prāṇa actually does not do anything. But the very fact that, when the Praṇa goes out, the sense-organs cease to function, shows that the Prāṇa does oblige the Jīva, by supporting the body and the sense-organs.

[368] (Sūtra 11) The objector says — If your contention viz Nāmabheda and Kāryabheda (different name and different activity) entitle an entity to be regarded as an independent one, then the five divisions of Prāṇa— Prāṇa, Apāna, Vyāna, Udāna and Samāna — ought to be classed as independent entities.

The Siddhāntin's reply is — Prāṇa, Apāṇa etc., are merely Vṛttiviśesas (different functions) of Prāṇa, which is clear from the Sruti-statement एतत्सर्वं प्राण एव. Similarly, the Sruti describes as Manas itself the various Vrttis of Manas—Kāma, Saṁkalpa, Vicikitsā, Śraddhā, Aśraddhā, Dhṛti, Adhṛti, Hrī, Dhī and Bhī.

[369] (Sūtra 12) The fifth Adhikaraṇa comprises only one Sūtra.

The Chief Prāṇa is Aṇu (subtle), as Utkrānti etc., are associated with him. Passages like सर्वं प्राणे प्रतिष्ठितम् which show Prāṇa to be all-pervading are to be understood as merely glorifying Prāṇa on whom the stability of everything depends.

[370] (Sūtra 13) The sixth Adhikaraṇa comprises two Sūtras.

प्राणवता शब्दात् is read by Saṅkara as a separate Sūtra.

Jīva is the Adhiṣṭhāna of Prāṇa etc., which are his means for enjoyment; the Śruti also speaks of Agni and other Deities as presiding over the sense-organs (Agni presides over Vāk; Āditya over the eye; Vāyu over the Prāṇa; Quarters over the ear; Herbs and plants over the hair; the Moon over the mind; Death over the Apāna; Waters over the semen).

The question is—Is this Adhiṣṭhāna of the Jiva (and the Deities) dependent on himself, or dependent on the Paramātman ?

प्राणवता—जीवेन; Rāmānuja, it appears, speaks of two Adhiṣṭhānas —one of the Jīva, and the other of the Deities. This does not seem to be intended.

Nimbārka—वागादिकरणजातम्, अग्न्यादिदेवताप्रेरितं कार्ये प्रवर्तते ।

Vijñānabhikṣu—प्रकृतस्य ब्रह्मणो ज्योतिरादिषु विराड्देहबीजेषु भूतमहत्सु, अधिष्ठानप्रवेशोऽस्ति । कुतः ? तदामननात्—'यदिदं किंच...अनुप्राविशत्' इत्यादिश्रुतिषु ।

The Siddhāntin's answer is—The Adhisthāna is dependent upon the will (Saṁkalpa) of the Lord, as the Śruti tells us (आमननम्—आभिमुख्येन मननम्... परमात्मनः संकल्पादेव).

(Sūtra 14) This परमात्माधिष्ठितत्व in the case of all is always there.

Śaṅkara—तस्य च शारीरस्यास्मिञ्शरीरे भोक्तृत्वेन नित्यत्वम् (न देवतानाम्) ।

Bhāskara—तस्य करणजातस्य शरीरं प्रति नियतत्वात् ।

Vijñānabhikṣu—तस्य च प्राणवतो जीवस्य नित्यत्वात्, अनेन जीवेन, इति शब्दः सिद्धवत्, निर्दिशति, इत्यर्थः ।

[371] (Sūtra 15) The seventh Adhikaraṇa comprises two Sūtras. The question is whether the Indriyas (pointed out by the word Prāṇa) include the Chief Prāṇa or not.

The Siddhānta is that the Chief Prāṇa is distinct from the Indriyas, as the Sruti uses the word Indriya spacifically in the case of the eye etc., and Manas.

(Sūtra 16) The Śruti एतस्माज्जायते प्राणो मनः सर्वेन्द्रियाणि च mentions Prāṇas as distinct from the Indriyas (Manas is included among the Indriyas by the *Gitā* मनःषष्ठानीन्द्रियाणि). That the Indriyas are different from Prāṇa is *reasonable*, on account of the difference in their working—

(1) Prāṇa functions in the state of deep sleep; the sense-organs etc., do not.

(2) Prāṇa acts as the support of the body and the Indriyas; the Indriyas and Manas are the means for perception and activity.

(3) All activity depends on Prāṇa.

[372] (Sūtra 17) The eighth Adhikaraṇa contains three Sūtras.

संज्ञा-मूर्ति-क्लृप्ति is the same as नाम-रूप-व्याकरण.

त्रिवृत्करण is the Tri-partite modification of पृथिवी, अप् and तेजस्.

$$\left(\text{पृथिवी} - \frac{\text{पृथिवी}}{2} + \frac{\text{अप्}}{4} + \frac{\text{तेजस्}}{4} ; \quad \text{अप्} - \frac{\text{अप्}}{2} + \frac{\text{तेजस्}}{4} + \frac{\text{पृथिवी}}{4} ; \quad \text{तेजस्} - \frac{\text{तेजस्}}{2} + \frac{\text{पृथिवी}}{4} + \frac{\text{अप्}}{4} \right)$$

The question is — Is the creation involving नामरूपव्याकरण due to Hiraṇyagarbha (Brahmadeva) or to the Highest Brahman with Hiraṇyagarbha as its body ?

The Pūrvapakṣin says — The creation is by Hiraṇyagarbha. The expression अनेन जीवेन, आत्मना, अनुप्रविश्य नामरूपे व्याकरवाणि shows that the Jīva is the Kartṛ; the Parā Devatā could act only by her portion, the Jīva. व्याकरवाणि cannot be taken as being used in a metaphorical sense; for, the अनुप्रवेश and व्याकरण are possible in the Jīva who is a portion of the Highest. (In the expression like चारेणानुप्रविश्य परबलं संकलयामि uttered by a king, the अनुप्रवेश and संकलन have to be explained metaphorically in the case of the king, as there is a distinct difference of nature (Svarūpabheda) between the king and spy; in the present case, there is no Svarūpabheda between the Jīva and the Paramātman). To take अनेन जीवेन to mean 'along with this Jīva' is unfair to the instrumental case (जीवेन) which has a Kāraka-sense. Nor again is the Jiva the chief operative instrument of Brahman. We cannot divide the two functions अनुप्रवेश and व्याकरण

between Jīva and Brahman, as the gerund अनुप्रविश्य shows that both the functions belong to one and the same agent. So, Hiraṇyagarbha must be regarded as being responsible for नामरूपव्याकरण, as is clearly stated in the *Viṣṇupurāṇa.*

[373] The Siddhānta is — नामरूपव्याकरण is carried out by the Highest Brahman that first effected the tri-partite modification. The Trivṛt-karaṇa could not have been effected by Brahmadeva who was *within the* Egg that was originated by the three elements Tejas, Ap, and Anna made three-fold. आत्मना जीवेन — this Sāmānādhikaraṇya shows that by Jīva we must understand the Highest Brahman with Jīva as its body. Thus would both Anupraveśa and Vyākaraṇa be understood in their primary sense.

[374] The objector points out that it is possible to argue that Trivṛt-karaṇa is possible in the case of Jīva. The Śruti itself says that after the creation of the Egg, the food eaten becomes three-fold—Excretion, flesh and mind; the Trivṛt-karaṇa is also spoken of in the case of Agni, the Sun, the Moon, and the Lightning.'

[375] (Sūtra 18) The objector's view may be elaborated as follows :—

The Śruti says अन्नमशितं त्रेधा भवति (त्रेधा भवति is but त्रिवृत्करण). Anna becomes three-fold after being eaten (it was not Trivṛt already) in the form of (1) Purīṣa (Pṛthivīrūpa), (2) Māṁsa which is less solid (Jalarūpa) and (3) Manas still more subtle (Tejorūpa).

आपः पीताः — Waters drunk become three-fold in the form of (1) Urine (Pṛthivīrūpa), (2) Blood (Jalarūpa) and (3) Prāṇa (Tejorūpa).

अशितं तेजस् — Tejas becomes three-fold when consumed in the form of (1) Asthi, bones (Pṛthivīrūpa), (2) Marrow (Jalarūpa) and (3) Vāk (Tejorūpa).

Thus, Food, Water and Tejas become each mixed with the other two elements later and become Trivṛt.

The Siddhāntin says — The objector's view is open to objection. If that view is accepted, Māṁsa and Manas would have to be regarded as watery and constituted of Tejas respectively, Mūtra and Prāṇa also as constituted of Pṛthivī and Tejas respectively. But no one understands the position like that.

Māṁsa and Manas are Pārthiva like the Purīṣa; that is, all the three are modifications of Pṛthivī; Urine, Blood and Prāṇa are modifications of water; Bones, Marrow and Vāk are modifications of Tejas. In this way passages like अन्नमयं हि सोम्य मनः can be properly explained. The elements prior to going through the Trivṛt-karaṇa cannot function; their activity commences only when they are mixed or compounded together.

The Trivṛt-karaṇa in the case of Agni, Āditya etc, which were within the Egg is referred to, to teach Śvetaketu who was himself within the Egg, and hence unable to understand the Trivṛt-karaṇa obtaining in entities outside the Egg.

[376] (Sūtra 19) The objector asks—If every entity is thus a compound of three elements, how is it that we name some entities as only Pṛthivī or Ap, or Tejas ?

The answer is—Entities are named in accordance with the Ādhikya or preponderance of the element constituting them. An entity is called Pārthiva, if half of it is constituted of Pṛthivī; Ap, if half of it is constituted of Water; Tejas, if half of it is constituted of Tejas (this is what is implied in the Trivṛt-karaṇa process).

The Second Adhyāya is called अविरोधाध्याय, where is shown how the different Śrutis and Smṛti passages (that are in conformity with the Sruti) could be harmonised.

The First Quarter shows how the Sāṅkhya, Yoga and Vaiśeṣika doctrines are faulty and the inferences drawn from them are untrustworthy. The relation of cause and effect (Kāryakāraṇabhāva) is shown in its proper light, and the exact part played by Īśvara is pointed out.

The Second Quarter deals with the Sāṅkhya, Vaiśeṣika, Buddhist, Jaina, Pāśupata and Pāñcarātra doctrines. This is usually called Tarkapāda, but the Sūtrakāra does not hesitate to invoke the aid of Śruti, when he is in a tight corner. One gets the impression that the Sūtrakāra is content to stand by the contradictory Śrutis (e. g., the Niravayavatva of Brahman, and still the ability of Brahman to create without undergoing any change) and makes no attempt to suggest some solution, as is done by Rāmānuja and Śaṅkara.

The Third Quarter deals with the origination and dissolution of the elements and discusses very important matters like the origination, size freedom of the will etc., of the Individual Soul In spite of Rāmānuja's efforts to prove to the contrary, the Individual Soul does not appear to be atomic in size, according to the Sūtrakāra. Here also, it is clearly seen that the Sūtrakāra is more concerned with putting forth the opposing views, and giving suitable analogies, rather than declaring his own view in an emphatic manner.

The Fourth Quarter deals with the origination of the Liṅgaśarīra (the sense-organs, mind etc.), and the Trivṛt-karaṇa.

The views of the different Bhāṣyakāras have been given in their own words, on various points, in order to enable the reader to judge for himself what interpretation would be the most probable. Śaṅkara's views have been frequently drawn upon, as Rāmānuja is particularly anxious to measure swords with him in season and out of season. It is no doubt difficult to find out exactly what was in the mind of the Sūtrakāra, but the student is furnished with sufficient material to ponder the matter in a judicial spirit.

The Third Adhyāya is called Sādhana as it deals with the means etc., of securing Mokṣa ultimately.

The First Quarter describes the departure of the Soul to the Moon, and his return to this world to take another body, in the case of those who have only Karmans, good or evil, to their credit. The whole discussion is calculated to create a feeling of Vairāgya in a person desirous of salvation.

[377] (Sūtra 1) The first Adhikaraṇa contains seven Sūtras.

The passage discussed is from the *Chāndogya*, where Pravāhaṇa asks questions about the path taken by the Karmins after death and how they return to this world, to which Śvetaketu gives appropriate answers (one would have expected that the path (Pitṛyāṇa) of the Karmins after death would be dealt with first, but the Sūtras refer to the return-journey. The Pitṛyāṇa path is described later).

The question asked is—How do the waters offered, become fit to be called the Purusa at the fifth offering ?

The answer gives details about the five offerings, culminating into the emergence of the Soul on the earth thus—

(1) The Devas offer Śraddhā (Waters) in the Fire (Dyuloka), and out of that emerges King Soma. (देवा.— प्राणाः; श्रद्धा — आपः; सोमो राजा — the immortal Soma or refulgent body).

(2) The second offering is that of Soma in the Fire (Parjanya) and Rain comes into being.

(3) The third offering is that of Rain in the Fire (Pṛthivī) and Food comes out of it.

(4) The fourth offering is that of Food in the Fire (Puruṣa) and Semen comes out it.

(5) The fifth offering is that of Semen in the Fire (Woman) and the embryo comes into being.

Thus at the fifth offering, waters become transformed into a human being.

It is true that the waters are actually mentioned only at the fifth offering, but they are there in a subtle form throughout and so, the Jīva is accompanied by the subtle elements which would be at hand for forming up a new body. (The objector's contention was that the subtle elements were available anywhere, and so the Jīva need not carry any additional burden with him, when departing from the body. The Siddhāntin's view is that it is certainly better to be forearmed always.)

[378] (Sūtra 2) The objector argues — The Sruti-passage speaks of waters only; we should legitimately conclude therefore that only the water-

element accompanies the Jīva. How can we refer to all the three elements then?

The answer is — It is true that the Trivṛt-karaṇa process refers to three elements, Pṛthivī, Ap and Tejas. But here only Ap is mentioned, as water is the major constituent of the human body.

(Sūtra 3) Further, the Śruti speaks of all the Prāṇas (sense-organs) as going out when the Chief Prāṇa goes out. The Prāṇas must have some resort which can only be the subtle elements.

[379] (Sūtra 4) The objector says—There is another Sruti which speaks of Vāk, Prāṇa and Cakṣus as being merged into Fire, Wind and Āditya respectively. This shows that the subtle elements do not accompany the Jīva.

The Siddhāntin—The merging referred to is metaphorical only, as is clear from the fact that the description of soft hair entering into the herbs and other hair into trees, in the same passage, must not be understood literally, as no such experience can be had. Therefore, the Śruti describing the merging refers to the withdrawal of the Deities presiding over the eye etc.

[380] (Sūtra 5) The objector argues—The waters are specifically mentioned in the last Homa, while only Śraddhā is mentioned in the first Homa. How are we to reconcile this?

The answer is—It is sufficiently clear that the question and the answer refer to the waters specifically mentioned in the fifth Homa; so, we shall have to take Śraddhā to mean ' waters ' for the sake of consistency. Śraddhā, Somarāja, Varṣa, Anna and Retas are the forms successively assumed by the waters before they could be Puruṣavacas. In the Vedic literature we actually read श्रद्धा वा आपः, and waters are said to have the form of Soma.

[381] (Sūtra 6) The objector points out that in the above description, there is no reference to the Jīva; only Śraddhā etc., are described as being offered; nowhere is it stated that the Jīva is enveloped by them.

The Siddhāntin—If the objector looks carefully into the passages further on, and takes into account the context, he would see that the performers of sacrificial and pious deeds (इष्टापूर्ते*—इष्ट is the performance of sacrifices as ordained by the Sāstras ; पूर्तं—the construction of wells, Dharmaśālas etc.,) are described as going to the Moon ard returning therefrom after their Karmans have ceased giving their fruit. The सोमस्यदेह really points out to the Jīva.

[382] (Sūtra 7) The objector points out that the passage तं देवा भक्षयन्ति shows that the Jīva cannot be referred to here by तं, as Jīva cannot be eaten.

---

*वापीकूपतडागादिदेवतायतनानि च ।
अन्नप्रदानमारामाः पूर्तमर्थ्याः प्रचक्षते ॥
एकाग्निकर्महवनं त्रेतायां यच्च हूयते ।
अन्तर्वेद्यां च यद्दानमिष्टं तदभिधीयते ॥

The Siddhāntin—The Jīvas who have to their credit only Ista and Pūrta not having realised the Ātman are metaphorically described as the food for the Gods (The eating by the gods means only the satisfaction of the gods) The *Gītā* also supports the view that the Ātman-knowers alone attain to Brahman, and the Anātmavids are देवभोग्य

Madhva explains भाक्तत्वम् as partly

[383] (Sūtra 8) The second Adhikarana comprises four Sutras

The question discussed is—The Jīvas who have to their credit Ista and Pūrta works travel by the Pitryāna path to the Moon and return again to this world—Do these returning Jīvas come back with some remainder of their Karmans or not?

The Pūrvapaksin says that the Jīvas are entitled to stay with the Moon till all their Karmans are fully exhausted the expression यावत्सम्पातमुषित्वा (सम्पात means Karman) points out to the enjoyment of the entire Karman So it is clear that the Jīvas return without any residue of the Karman accompanying them

[384] The Siddhāntin says—Both the Sruti and Smrti make it quite clear that some Anuśaya (remainder) of the Karman accompanies the Jīvas The Jīvas have to take up another body on their return and this is possible if some Karman has remained to give its fruit We are told that रमणीयचरण Jīvas secure a रमणीय body, and so forth those who observe carefully the duties of the Varnas and the Āsramas, attain to a birth in some good family etc यावत्सम्पातम् does not refer to the entire Karman, but only to what is ready to give its fruit (The ascent to the Moon is by way of Dhūma, Rātri the Dark fort night Daksināyana six months Pitrloka Ākāsa and the Moon the descent from the Moon is by way of Ākāsa Vayu Smoke Cloud and Rain cloud)

Madhva splits the Sūtra into two Sūtras forming two Adhikaranas (यथेतमनेवं च is made an independent Sutra)

[385] (Sutra 9) The objector says that the Sruti uses the expression रमणीयचरणा Carana means 'conduct', 'character' not Karman in the *Taittirya Āranyaka* Carana and Karman are shown as distinct So according to the Sruti it is Carana and not Anuśaya of the Karman that enables the Jiva to take up another body

Kārsnājini thus answers the objection—Happiness and misery are the fruits of Karman (in the form of merit and demerit) and do not arise from mere Ācāra (conduct) So the Carana Sruti must be taken to refer ultimately to Karman

[386] (Sutra 10) Acāra enjoined by the Smrtis is not useless it must be scrupulously adhered to for meritorious Karman depends upon it It is obvious that only persons who have good conduct to their credit, can perform meritorious acts

(Sutra 11) Badari is of opinion that the word Carana itself means Karman (पुण्यं कर्म चरति) It is unnecessary to arrive at that meaning indirectly as Karsnajini does

Rāmānuja adds that the Sūtrakāra agrees with Bādari.

[387] (Sūtra 12) The third Adhikarana comprises ten Sūtras.

Rāmānuja takes Sūtras 12–16 as forming the Pūrvapakṣa. According to Saṅkara, Sūtra 12 alone advocates the Pūrvapakṣa.

The objector taking his stand on the passage ये वै के चास्माल्लोकात्प्रयान्ति चन्द्रमसमेव ते सर्वे गच्छन्ति, says that all—इष्टकारिन्‌s and अनिष्ट (पाप) कारिन्‌s go to the Moon.

(Sūtra 13) The अनिष्टकारिन्‌s, however, first go to Saṁyamana, the capital of Yama to experience the fruit of their evil deeds.

(Sūtra 14) The *Viṣṇupurāṇa* and other Smṛtis speak of all these coming under the jurisdiction of Yama.

(Sūtra 15) Seven hells (Raurava and others) are mentioned in this connection.

(Sūtra 16) Under the orders of Yama, the अनिष्टकारिन्‌s go to different hells.

The अनिष्टकारिन्‌s then go to the Moon and then descend down to the Earth.

Sūtra 13 contains the expression आरोहावरोहौ. The objector takes आरोह to mean ascent to the Moon; as hells are usually understood to be in the nether regions, the Pūrvapakṣin has no alternative but to make the अनिष्टकारिन्‌s go to the Moon, before they descend down to the Earth. But there is no authority for all this.

No point is gained by Rāmānuja in taking 12–16 as Pūrvapakṣa-sūtras. The Sūtrakāra seems to have referred to the fate of the अनिष्टकारिन्‌s in passing, to have the record complete, so to speak (ज्ञानिन्‌s or भक्तs go by the Devayāna path; इष्टादिकारिन्‌s to the Moon by the Pitṛyāṇa, and the अनिष्टादिकारिन्‌s to the Yamaloka). Rāmānuja really ought not to have any objection to the mention of hells and Yamaloka, gruesome descriptions of which are given in the Purāṇas. The Sūtrakāra apparently bows to the widely prevalent belief in Yamaloka etc., and finds room for such ideas in the Sūtras.

It appears that the use of आरोह and अवरोह in Sūtra 13, shows that Yamaloka was believed to have been somewhere in the heavens (not necessarily in the nether regions, which idea became fixed up later).

[388] (Sūtra 17) The Siddhāntin thus refutes the Pūrvapakṣa view —

The context shows that the Śruti deals with only two classes of Jīvas, and two paths—those having Vidyā to their credit go by the Devayāna path; and those having good Karman to their credit go by the Pitṛyāṇa. There is no question here as to what happens in the case of the अनिष्टकारिन्‌s. The expression ये वै के च means 'all those without exception, who are इष्टादिकारिन्‌s'.

[389] (Sūtra 18) The objector queries — In that case, how can the अनिष्टकारिन्‌s secure a new body ? The Śruti speaks of the new body as a result of the fifth Āhuti, which presupposes going to the Moon.

The Sūtrakāra's answer is — The Sruti says पञ्चम्यामाहुतौ, not पञ्चम्यामाहुतौ एव, which shows that the शरीरारम्भ is not due to the fifth Āhuti alone

The अनिष्टकारिन्s go to the 'Third place' (where there is no need for the fifth Āhuti) which rules out going to, and coming back from the Dyuloka

(Sūtra 19) It is well-known that Draupadi, Dhrstadyumna and others (who are Ayonija) did not go through the fifth Āhuti for their birth

(Sūtra 20) The Sruti also speaks of three kinds of beings—Andaja Jivaja, and Udbhijja, where the Udbhijja (trees, plants etc,) do not require the fifth Āhuti

(Sūtra 21) Udbhijja includes the Samśokaja or Svedaja beings as well

Thus it is established that the पापकारिन्s do not go to the Moon for no purpose is served thereby

[390] (Sūtra 22) The fourth Adhikarana contains only one Sutra

The question is—When it is said that the Jiva on his way back to this world becomes Ākāśa, Vāyu, Dhūma, Abhra and Megha—does it mean that the Jiva secures the nature of these, or is there merely सादृश्यादिभाव ?

The Siddhānta is—The Jiva becomes only similar to these, there is no तद्भाव as there is no scope here for the experience of happiness and misery

Śankara reads साभाव्यापत्ति for तत्साभाव्यापत्ति

[391] (Sūtra 23) The fifth Adhikarana contains only one Sūtra

The transition from Ākāśa to Varsa (rain) takes place quickly, it is only after the Jīva has secured व्रीहिसाम्य, the transition is a laborious process

दुर्निष्प्रपतरम् is Vedic for दुर्निष्प्रपततरम् (one त is elided).

[392] (Sūtra 24) The sixth Adhikarana contains four Sūtras

The objector argues—The Sruti says त इह व्रीहियवा जायन्ते which obviously means that the Souls are born with Vrihi etc, as their bodies (जायन्ते must be taken in the primary sense), and become enjoyers

The Siddhānta is — The Vrihi, Yava etc, are merely in contact with the Jivas as in the case of the series from Ākāśa to Megha जायन्ते is just metaphorical, for, there is no fruit of the Karman to be enjoyed here by the Jiva

[393] (Sūtra 25) The objector says — There is some Hetu (reason) for the Jiva being an enjoyer here also The performance of sacrifices etc involves Himsā, and so is mixed with some sin, and the activity about the sacrifice, like any other Karman, must be taken to be caused by attachment to the fruit accruing from the same It is better, therefore to hold that the Jivas experience the fruit of the impure Karman, on being reduced to the state of Vrihi etc

The answer is — Himsā sanctioned by the Sāstras is no Himsā, and there can be no impurity involved in the performance of a sacrifice Actually according to the Sāstras, the victim in the sacrifice is quite uninjured (though suffering somewhat and goes to the Gods,

(Sūtra 26) The emergence of Jīva as Vrīhi etc., is metaphorical; if Vrīhyādibhāva is real, when Vrīhi etc , are being boiled and cooked, the Jīvas also would have to go through that ordeal ! Besides, it is only after the Vrīhyādibhāva, that the ejection of the semen (which causes birth of some entity) is mentioned in connection with the eater of food etc.

(Sūtra 27) There can not be any body constituted of Vrīhi etc., for the Jīva; a body can come into being only after the connection with the Strīyoni.

According to Madhva, the Parameśvara is the Director of the Jīvas even in hell where there is only misery experienced. The word Śabda in Sūtra 21 refers to swoon; and an additional Sūtra स्मरणाच्च is there after Sūtra 21.

III. 2

This Quarter deals with the different states — Waking, Dream, Deep-sleep and Swoon—associated with the Jīva, and the nature of Brahman.

The first Adhikaraṇa contains six Sūtras (the first two Sūtras give the Pūrvapakṣa).

[394] (Sūtra 1) The objector says—The Sruti says that the Jīva creates chariots, horses etc., in a dream; this is reasonable, as it is the Jīva who sees the dream (the word Saṁdhya means the dream-state).

(Sūtra 2) Some recensions go still further and say that the Jīva is the creator of all objects, sons etc., liked by him, in dream. So, Jīva is the creator, and not Īśvara, in the dream-state.

[395] (Sūtra 3) The Siddhānta is — The dream-creation is an extraordinary wonderful (Māyā) creation, which can be attributed only to the Paramapuruṣa. Māyāmātram thus can only mean 'created by the Paramapuruṣa'. It is true that the Jīva also is Satyasaṁkalpa, but that nature of his is not fully manifested in the Samsāra state, and so, Jīva can not be the creator of the objects in dream. The Śruti also further says that all the worlds resort to Brahman alone. From a proper consideration of the Upakrama and the Upasaṁhāra of the passages in question, it is clear that the Paramapuruṣa is the creator of dream-objects.

Madhva takes मायामात्रम् to mean स्वेच्छामात्रम्.

[396] (Sūtra 4) The natural auspicious form (कल्याणरूप) of the Jīva is obscured and so, the qualities, having the sins destroyed etc., are not manifested so long as the Jīva is not Mukta, owing to the will (Abhidhyāna) of the Paramapuruṣa.

(Sūtra 5) The Tirobhāva of the natural attributes of the Jīva, can be explained also by the Jīva's association with the body (at the time of creation) or the association with the subtle Acit-element (at the time of Pralaya).

(Sūtra 6) The interpreters of dreams tell us, that the dreams do indicate auspicious and inauspicious future events. Such an indication is not possible if the dreams were to depend upon the Saṁkalpa of the Jīva. So, Īśvara is the creator of the dream-creation.

Rāmānuja's interpretation of this Adhikaraṇa is far from convincing:—

(1) The Śruti specifically says that the Jīva is the creator; it is unfair therefore to regard this as the Pūrvapakṣa, that the Paramapuruṣa is ultimately the creator is not relevant here.

(2) Rāmānuja, strangely enough speaks of Jīva's natural form as being सत्यसंकल्परूप and कल्याणरूप.

(3) The Sūtra सूचकश्च etc., is read by him as the last Sūtra in this Adhikaraṇa, as he holds the view that the dream-creation is real (Saṅkara and others read the Sūtra as coming immediately after Sūtra 3, मायामात्रं etc).

(4) Rāmānuja takes माया to mean आश्चर्य and makes matters worse by adding परमपुरुषसृष्टमित्यर्थः; if everything according to Rāmānuja is परमपुरुषसृष्ट, there is no point in referring to that here. The trend of the wording of the Sūtra does not justify the conclusion that the Jīva could not create the dream-creation as he does not manifest his full powers then. The natural meaning appears to be—The Arthajāta in the dream is Māyā, because the nature of the Arthajāta is not fully manifested as in a real creation; that is, the Anabhivyaktasvarūpa belongs to the Arthajāta, and not to the Jīva. A wonderful feat would require the fullest manifestation of all powers possessed by one. Rāmānuja knows this and adds तथाविधा (मायामात्र) सृष्टिर्जीवस्य नोपपद्यते as he ascribes the Anabhivyaktasvarūpa to Jīva.

On the other hand, Śaṅkara's interpretation appears to be more natural and appropriate. According to Śaṅkara, the question is whether the dream-creation is real or not.

The Pūrvapakṣa is that it is real.

The Siddhānta is that the dream-creation is not real as it does not show देशकालनिमित्तसंपत्ति and अबाध which distinguish a real creation from an unreal one—

(1) In a dream, one can travel hundreds of miles, though the body remains at the same place (thus there is देशविसंवाद).

(2) There is कालविसंवाद —Though asleep at night time, the dreamer dreams that it is day time (रजन्यां सुप्तो वासरं भारते वर्षे मन्यते— Saṅkara is aware that night time in Bhārata may be day time in some other continent or Varṣa. Hundreds of years can be passed in a dream lasting for only a Muhūrta.

(3) There is निमित्तविसंवाद —No material is required to create in a dream and things change over quickly or disappear altogether.

All this shows that the creation in a dream is mere illusion which, however, can indicate some real future event. The powers of the Jīva are screened by Avidyā etc., and become manifest only by the grace of the Highest due to meditation. Bondage and salvation depend on the Lord. The ज्ञानैश्वर्यतिरोभाव in the case of the Jīva is due to his association with the body, mind, sense-organs etc. (एवमविद्यादिप्रत्युपस्थापितनामरूपकृतदेहाद्युपाधियोगात्तदविवेकभ्रमकृतो जीवस्य ज्ञानैश्वर्यतिरोभावः)

[397] (Sūtra 7) The second Adhikaraṇa contains two Sūtras and deals with Suṣupti.

In the Suṣupti-state, the Jīva stays in the Ātman, via the Nāḍīs and the Purītat (the Nāḍī which goes right up to the heart). The Nāḍīs, Purītat and Ātman are not three different places, though the Śruti speaks of the three as Suṣupti-sthānas, as one can say—he sleeps on the bed on the cot in the palace.

Saṅkara says—द्वारमात्रं नाड्यः पुरीतच्च, ब्रह्मैव त्वेकं सुषुप्तिस्थानम् । नाडीद्वारापि ब्रह्मोपसर्पन् सुप्त एव नाडीषु भवति । यो गङ्गया सागरं गच्छति गत एव स गङ्गाया भवति ।

(Sūtra 8) The awakening of the Jīva takes place when he comes out of Brahman where he had slept.

[398] (Sūtra 9) The third Adhikaraṇa contains only one Sūtra.

The question is—Is the awakened Jīva the same who had slept, or some one else ? For, it is possible to argue that the sleeper merged into Brahman is as good as one Released, and has no connection further with his sense-organs etc.

The Siddhānta is—The Jīva who was asleep and the Jīva who was awakened later must be one and the same :—

(1) The fruit of the Karman performed by the Jīva has to be experienced by him alone.

(2) On awakening, the Jīva remembers that he is the same one who was asleep.

(3) The Sruti says that whatsoever forms those in the state of Suṣupti had before, of a tiger, wolf etc.,—the same they secure after being awakened.

(4) Injunctions given in the Sāstras would be meaningless, if the awakened Jīva is different from the one asleep.

[399] (Sūtra 10) The fourth Adhikaraṇa contains only one Sūtra.

The question discussed is whether the state of swoon is a distinct state or not.

The Siddhānta is that Swoon (Mūrchā) is a distinct state; it is half-way towards Death. It cannot be the state of waking or dreaming; for, there is no consciousness of any thing in Swoon. Besides, the swoon is caused generally by some visible agency like a blow on the head, and is characterised by contortions of the body, which is not the case with Deep-sleep or Death. So, it is better to regard the swoon state as a distinct state heading towards death.

[400] (Sūtra 11) The fifth Adhikaraṇa comprises 15 Sūtras, and is an important one dealing with the real nature of Brahman. The Sūtras are variously interpreted by the different Bhāṣyakāras, to secure support for their own doctrines.

According to Rāmānuja, the question dealt with is — Do the blemishes of the Jīva in the different states of waking, dreaming, deep-sleep and swoon, affect the Highest Brahman, the inner Controller ?

The Pūrvapakṣin argues that the Antaryāmin, though not subject to Karman, is bound to be affected by the contact with the impure body etc., dealing with Apuruṣārtha.

[401] The Siddhānta is — There cannot be any tinge of Apuruṣārtha in Brahman, even when there is the association with different states; for, the Sruti everywhere speaks of two-fold characteristics of Brahman, viz. the complete expulsion of all blemishes, and being the mine of all auspicious qualities.

Rāmānuja apparently takes न स्थानेतोऽपि परस्य in the Sūtra, as complete in itself and takes उभयलिङ्ग to mean निर्दोषत्व and कल्याणगुणाकरत्व. This way of splitting

the Sūtra makes अपि almost lose its force: for, the आकाङ्क्षा raised by अपि remains unfulfilled—Even if the different states are fully taken into account,—one surely wants to know what happens to the पर. Anyway उभयलिङ्गत्व cannot be divorced from पर.

Śaṅkara's interpretation is more convincing; he takes न स्थानतोऽपि परस्योभयलिङ्गम् as complete in itself. The two-fold nature of Brahman as Nirviśeṣa and Saviśeṣa (which brings out the contrast more effectively) can not be justified even by taking into consideration the different states mentioned before; for, everywhere Brahman is said to be of one form, rather having no form at all, अरूपवदेव (Sūtra 14).

[402-403] (Sūtra 12) Wherever the Antaryāmin is spoken of as distinct from the Jīva, he is described as Amṛta, which shows that he could have no truck with Apuruṣārtha; only Jīva, being subject to Karman, is liable to be associated with things leading to Apuruṣārtha.

(Sūtra 13) Some recensions specifically say the Jīva alone is the enjoyer, while the Para is possessed of Dīpti depending upon his own glory as the over-lord.

[404] (Sūtra 14) The Sruti describes Brahman as producing name and form, on entering into the elements with the Living Self; this does not mean that Brahman is connected with the bodies of men, gods etc., or shares in the name and form.

Rāmānuja explains अरूपवत् as रूपरहिततुल्य; Brahman, being not subject to Karman, only completes the name and form, and so, is as good as not having any form.

Śaṅkara takes अरूपवत् to mean निर्विशेष (this is obviously a more natural interpretation). Being without a form is the principal nature of Brahman; passages describing any form of diversity in Brahman must be regarded as being subordinate to those that describe its Nirviśeṣatva.

Madhva takes अरूपवत् to mean प्राकृतरूपहीन.

[405] (Sūtra 15) Just as Brahman is taken to be प्रकाशवत् (possessed of light or intelligence), so that the Sruti-passages सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं... etc., may not be meaningless, we must understand passages describing Brahman to be सत्यसंकल्प etc., also in a literal sense. Thus Brahman is Ubhayaliṅga.

There is no doubt that Rāmānuja's interpretation of प्रकाशवत् is not acceptable. प्रकाशवत् must mean 'like light', that is, प्रकाश furnishes a similar instance, if we take into account similar expressions in the Sūtras.

Śaṅkara's interpretation is more convincing—Just as light seems to assume different forms under different conditions, Brahman appears as Saviśeṣa, owing to the Upādhis; in this way Saviśeṣa passages can be properly explained away.

(Sūtra 16) The passage सत्यं ज्ञानं... merely points out to the प्रकाशस्वरूपता of Brahman; it has no power to repudiate other attributes referred to in other passages.

Sañkara takes तन्मात्र to mean 'निर्विशेष only'.

(Sūtra 17) The Sruti and Smṛti refer to the presence of auspicious qualities and the absence of blemishes in Brahman.

Śañkara — Both Śruti and Smṛti emphasise the निर्विशेषत्व of Brahman.

(Sūtra 18) Because Brahman is not contaminated by the blemishes associated with the different states, the Sūryaka (Sun's reflection) and घटाकाश illustrations are appropriately cited in this connection. (The Sun and the Ākāśa are not affected by the changes in their Upādhis).

According to Sañkara, the Sūryaka-illustration shows the unreal nature of the manifestations.

[406] (Sūtra 19) The objector objects to the Sūryaka illustration, as the Sun is wrongly apprehended as being in water, while Brahman does really stay in Pṛthivī etc.

Madhva explains अम्बुवदग्रहणात् as अम्बुवत् स्नेहेन ग्रहणं ज्ञाने भक्ति विना.

(Sūtra 20) The Siddhāntin says that the illustration simply shows that Brahman does not participate in the changes, increase, decrease etc., seen in the different places or states, and is not contaminated by the blemishes thereof.

In this way, both the illustrations, Sūryaka and Ghaṭākāśa (given in the Yājñavalkyasmṛti) are appropriate. Expressions like 'Mānavaka is a lion' are significant likewise (Usually दर्शनात्, दर्शयति etc, refer to some Śruti passage, and not to popular sayings like सिंहो माणवकः).

Śañkara says – The reflections of the Sun participate in the increase and decrease of the water etc., while the Sun remains quite unaffected; similarly Brahman remains unaffected by the Upādhis that alone undergo any changes— thus there is the appropriate nature of both Dṛṣṭānta and Dārṣṭāntika.

Śañkara reads दर्शनाच्च as a separate Sūtra referring to the Śruti पुरश्चक्रे द्विपदः पुरश्चक्रे चतुष्पदः ... (*Bṛhadāraṇyaka*).

Śañkara here criticises in detail the view of those who divide the above Sūtras into two Adhikaraṇas, and justifies his position in regarding all the Sūtras as referring to one topic :—

अत्र केचिद् द्वे अधिकरणे कल्पयन्ति—प्रथमं तावत्, किं प्रत्यस्तमिताशेषप्रपञ्चमेकाकारं ब्रह्म, उत प्रपञ्चवदनेकाकारोपेतम्, इति । द्वितीयं तु, प्रत्यस्तमितप्रपञ्चत्वे, किं सल्लक्षणं ब्रह्म : उत बोधलक्षणम् : उत, उभयलक्षणम्, इति । अत्र वयं वदामः— सर्वथाप्यानर्थक्यमधिकरणान्तरारम्भस्य, इति । यदि तावदनेकलिङ्गत्वं परस्य ब्रह्मणो निराकर्तव्यम्, इत्ययं प्रयास, तत्पूर्वेणैव 'न स्थानतोऽपि' इत्यनेनाधिकरणेन निराकृतमित्युत्तरमधिकरणं 'प्रकाशवच्च' एतद् व्यर्थमेव भवेत् । न च सल्लक्षणमेव ब्रह्म, न बोधलक्षणम्, इति शक्यं वक्तुम्, विज्ञानघन एवे त्यादिश्रुतिवैयर्थ्यप्रसङ्गात । ... तस्मादस्मदुक्त एव विभाग आकारवदनाकारोपदेशानां युक्ततर इति ।

[407] (Sūtra 21) Śañkara begins a new Adhikaraṇa here, presumably because the well-known passage अथात आदेशो नेति नेति deserves to be treated with great respect. (Nimbārka does the same).

Rāmānuja says that नेति नेति denies only the limited nature of the attributes mentioned in the passage, as is clear from the fact that more attributes are spoken of as possessed by Brahman.

Saṅkara says that only the Mūrta and Amūrta are repudiated, as Brahman is beyond these forms. Rāmānuja condemns this interpretation by Śaṅkara, remarking that it is ridiculous to say that the Śruti which itself mentions the attributes (which cannot be known from any other Pramāṇa) should have done so, simply to repudiate them afterwards Only प्रकृतैतावत्त्वप्रतिषेध is meant here.

[408] (Sūtra 22) The Śāstra describes Brahman as Avyakta (unmanifest).

(Sūtra 23) Both Sruti and Smṛti say that Brahman is realised in Saṁrādhana (devout meditation or contemplation).

[409] (Sūtra 24) Just as Vāmadeva and others realised Brahman as possessing Prakāśa (light, intelligence) as its nature, they realised also Brahman as characterised by Mūrtāmurtādi-prapañca. The repeated practice of Saṁrādhana enables one to realise Brahman's nature (संराधने—कर्मणि संराधनात्मके).

Śaṅkara—This Sūtra refutes the objection that, if संराध्यसंराधकभाव is admitted, the Highest and the Ātman would be different—just as light etc., (प्रकाश is taken as an illustration) appear to be Saviśeṣa, owing to the Upādhis (the intervention of the finger etc..) without giving up their original nature, the Ātmabheda is due to the Upādhis (कर्मणि—उपाधिषु). अभ्यासात्—वेदान्तेष्वभ्यासेन, असकृत्, जीवप्राज्ञयोरभेदः प्रतिपाद्यते ।

(Sūtra 25) Brahman is possessed of infinite auspicious qualities also, and so, it is Ubhayaliṅga.

Rāmānuja explains अनन्तेन as कल्याणगुणगणेन, and लिङ्गम् as उभयलिङ्गम्. This is hardly satisfactory.

Saṅkara explains अनन्तेन as प्राज्ञेनात्मना (एकत्वं गच्छति जीवः). Nimbārka agrees with Saṅkara. लिङ्ग refers to the Śruti passage स यो ह वै तत्परमं ब्रह्म वेद, ब्रह्मैव भवति etc.

Nimbārka explains प्रकाशादिवत् as follows :— Just as the Sun etc., become manifest only to persons who have mastery over the Mantras, Brahman is realised only by those who practise Saṁrādhana. Nimbārka's explanation does not appear to be satisfactory.

Madhva takes कर्मणि to mean विषयभूते तस्मिन् ब्रह्मणि, and प्रकाश, as साक्षात्कार. He also takes Sūtra 22 as forming an independent Adhikaraṇa. अनन्तेन is taken to mean अपरिमितसामर्थ्येनान्वितस्य प्रसादात्. Jīva by himself is incapable of securing Sākṣātkāra; he can achieve his purpose only by the grace of Brahman.

On the whole, it appears that Rāmānuja's interpretation of this Adhikaraṇa cannot carry conviction. The virtual splitting of the Sūtra as न स्थानतोऽपि and परस्य···, is unwarranted, if we evaluate the context properly; the interpretation of अरूपवदेव, तत्प्रधानत्वात् and तन्मात्रम् is unsatisfactory; प्रकाशवत् and प्रकाशादिवत् should have been understood as involving a Dṛṣṭānta; अनन्तेन cannot in any case refer to कल्याणगुणगण and so forth.

[410] (Sūtra 26) Rāmānuja takes Sūtras 26–29 as comprising a new Adhikaraṇa, while Śankara takes them as a continuation of the last Adhikaraṇa.

The question discussed is — What is the relation between Brahman and the Acit — whether it is in accordance with the Ahikuṇḍala-nyāya, or with the Ekajātiyoga (प्रभा and प्रभावत्) or, अंशांशिभाव (विशेषणतया)? The doubt arises because there are Śruti passages referring to difference and non-difference.

The Pūrvapakṣin says — The relation is that of the serpent and the coil, that is, the Acit is merely a संस्थानविशेष (particular arrangement) of Brahman.

(Sūtra 27) वा in the Sūtra repudiates the above view (Śaṅkara says the view in this Sūtra is not Sūtrakāra's)—Just as the light and its resort, though different, are one in so far as they are Tejas, there is तादात्म्य between Brahman and the अचिद्वस्तु.

(Sūtra 28) The word वा in the Sūtra here repudiates both the above views. The first (अहिकुण्डलवत्) is wrong: the next view which emphasises the एकजातियोग, is also wrong, because Brahman is said to be everything (though द्रव्यत्व is the genus in पृथिवी, जल etc., we cannot call them एक or सर्वे). The third view—Just as Jīva was spoken of before (अंशो नानाव्यपदेशात्, II. 3·42; प्रकाशादिवत्तु II. 3·45) as a portion of Brahman, the Acit also is a portion of Brahman—is the correct one.

(Sūtra 29) As the Śruti repudiates the attributes of Acit in Brahman, we have to admit अंशांशिभाव (due to the विशेषणविशेष्य relation) between the Acit and Brahman.

According to Śaṅkara पूर्ववत् refers to Sūtra 25 above (प्रकाशादिवच्चावैशेष्यम्). The प्रतिषेध refers to the repudiation of Prapañca as apart from Brahman.

Nimbārka holds that the relation between Brahman and Acit, is one of भेदाभेद as illustrated by the illustration of the serpent and the coil. Sūtra 27 प्रकाशाश्रयवद्वा refers to the same relation between Jīva and Brahman. पूर्ववद्वा refers to श्रुतेस्तु शब्दमूलत्वात् (II·1·27) which asks us to rely on the Śruti alone, and not to discuss questions like how Brahman which is impartite could undergo any modification. प्रतिषेधाच्च repudiates the existence of any blemishes in Brahman, as is clear from the Śruti, न लिप्यते लोकदुःखेन etc.

According to Madhva, the question is whether Brahman is both bliss, and one possessed of bliss. Brahman can be both like the serpent and the coil, or light and its resort, or like time which is both the characteristic (like the word पूर्वे) and the thing characterised.

According to Vallabha पूर्ववत् refers to Sūtras 14-18 above, showing Brahman to have no attributes. Brahman is also Ubhayarūpa.

It appears to us more probable that the Sūtrakāra does not show any preference for any particular view. He mentions the different views as being on the same level. Both Rāmānuja and Nimbārka ignore or attach no importance to वा in Sūtras 27 and 28. पूर्ववत् seems to refer to प्रकाशादिवत् (as

Śaṅkara says) rather than to a Sūtra in the second Pāda, as Nimbārka suggests.

[411] (Sūtra 30) The seventh Adhikaraṇa comprises seven Sūtras. The question discussed is whether there is anything beyond Brahman, as certain Śruti-expressions point out to that contingency. Thus—

(1) Brahman is called Setu (dam, bridge); this implies that there is something beyond the bridge, which is to be secured or reached.

(2) Brahman is described as having some Unmāna (limited measure) and is called Catuṣpāt, Ṣoḍaṣakala etc.

(3) There is the relation of प्राप्य and प्रापक between सेतुमत् and सेतु.

(4) The expression परात्पर shows that there is some पर beyond पर.

[412] (Sūtra 31) The Siddhānta is :—

There is nothing beyond Brahman; the expression Setu is used in a general sense, meaning ' what prevents any commixture '. सेतुं तीर्त्वा often means ' having secured the Setu ' (तीर्त्वा means प्राप्य).

(Sūtra 32) Expressions like Catuṣpāt etc., applied to Brahman are meant for Upāsanā, and not for indicating any measure which is impossible in the case of the limitless Brahman.

[413] (Sūtra 33) Just as light can be measured as associated with a window, jar etc., Brahman can be measured by its Upādhis.

(Sūtra 34) That there should be nothing beyond the पर Brahman is proper, because the प्राप्यपरमपुरुष is himself the cause of securing the Jīva for him (यमेवैष वृणुते तेन लभ्यः); no other agency is required as there is no other पर.

[414] (Sūtra 35) Whenever expressions like परात्पर are used, there the Śruti hastens to add नेत्यन्यत्परमस्ति; the पर alone is the cause of the world and is called महद्यशः (because no one can lord it over पर). All this shows that there is nothing beyond the पर.

ततो यदुत्तरतरम् — This must be interpreted in accordance with the context. ततः means हेतुतः, not ' beyond '. परात्परः — The omniscient Paramapuruṣa who is beyond the समष्टिपुरुष.

आपः प्रदुधे — here अप् means Pṛthivī.

Śaṅkara refers to the Śruti स्वमपीतो भवति which shows that any relation with Brahman must be due to the Upādhis, as one's own nature can never be extinct. Passages like स एवाधस्तात्, नेह नानास्ति किंचन show that nothing exists as apart for Brahman.

(Sūtra 36) That Brahman is all-pervading is clear from the use of words like Āyāma. अनेन—ब्रह्मणा: Śaṅkara explains अनेन as सेत्वादिव्यपदेशनिराकरणेन, अन्यप्रतिषेधसमाश्रयणेन च, and refers to श्रुतिस्मृतिन्यायs pointed out by आकाशवत्सर्वगतश्च नित्यः, ज्यायान्दिवः, नित्यः सर्वगतः स्थाणुरचलोऽयं सनातनः etc.

[415] (Sūtra 37) The eighth Adhikaraṇa contains four Sūtras.

The fruit aimed at—Mokṣa, as well as Aihika (belonging to this world) and Āmuṣkika (belonging to heaven etc.,)—comes from the Supreme Lord

alone. The evanascent Acetana Karman can not possibly be in a position to make this award.

(Sūtra 38) The Sruti actually says that the Paramātman is Annāda (Vedic form for Annada) Vasudāna etc., and is also the giver of Ānanda (Apavarga).

[416] (Sūtra 39) Jaimini holds the view that it is more appropriate to conclude that Karman gives the fruit; agricultural operations, the giving of gifts etc., are actually seen giving their fruit directly or indirectly. The sacrificial Karman as ordained by the Sāstras gives the fruit through the Apūrva which subsists even when the Karman has come to an end. So, no objection need be taken to this view.

[417] (Sūtra 40) Bādarāyaṇa, however, says that the fruit ought to come from the Lord. (The Sūtrakāra apparently agrees with Bādarāyaṇa; some think that Bādarāyaṇa himself is the Sūtrakāra). Without His will, nothing can happen. Even in the case of the sacrificial acts, the Śruti speaks of the different Deities to whom offerings are given, as the hetus (causes) of the different fruits desired. The root यज् means 'to worship the Gods.' The injunctions in connection with the sacrifices do point out how the fruit is to be obtained; as for instance, in the injunction वायव्यं श्वेतमालभेत भूतिकामः, it is clear that the Deity Vāyu is ultimately responsible for the prosperity (Bhūti) that the sacrificer in question wants to secure. So, when the Sruti itself points out to the source of the fruit, it is ridiculous to postulate any Apūrva not mentioned by the Śruti, as capable of giving the fruit. Of course, the Sruti and the Smṛti make it clear that as the Deities have the Paramapurusa as their Ātman, it is the grace of the Lord that is responsible for the fruit. Even in the popular illustration of the agriculturist securing his crops from the agricultural operations, it is possible to say that it is the King, in the ultimate analysis, who gives the fruit, when he or his officers are satisfied with the proper discharge of his duties by the farmer.

The third Quarter is called Guṇopasaṁhāra, as it discusses the question whether the details, different attributes etc., mentioned in the various Brahmavidyās scattered throughout the different recensions, are to be taken together for the purpose of meditation or Upāsana; and if so, under what conditions.

Certain Vidyās, though called by the same name, differ in their format, number of attributes, fruit etc., in different texts. If meditation is to be carried on properly, an authoritative decision in this connection is necessary.

Though the subject discussed here may be purely academic from the point of view of a modern student, the discussion is carried on meticulously in conformity with the Mīmāṁsā rules of interpretation, in a judicial manner, and the reader is bound to be impressed by the way the various criteria are ultimately formulated. In the case of sacrificial acts which are Sādhya (while the Vidyās deal with Siddha propositions), no such consideration is necessary, as all one has to do here is to follow the procedure strictly as laid down by the Śāstras.

According to Vallabha, this Quarter deals with the incarnations of Viṣṇu, and Madhva understands the Vedas, and not the Upaniṣads by the term Vedāntapratyaya.

Some critics hold that the very discussion of the Brahmavidyās shows that the Sūtrakāra could not have been an Advaitin, and Śaṅkara, according to whom only Brahman is real and Nirviśeṣa, had no business to discuss this topic at all. Such criticism betrays a total lack of proper appraisal of the Advaita. The critics should have gone further still, and objected to Śaṅkara's description of the world and its cause etc., the nature of rebirth and so forth, so that Śaṅkara could be accused of wasting his energy in writing a commentary on the Brahmasūtras and the Upaniṣads ! Time and again, Śaṅkara has made it quite clear that sacrificial acts, meditation etc., are quite useful in producing Cittaśuddhi in one aspiring for Mokṣa. From the Vyāvahārika point of view, Saguṇa or Saviśeṣa Brahman does exist, and its Upāsanā enables one to realise the Highest Brahman in course of time.

[418] The first Adhikaraṇa comprises five Sūtras.

(Sūtra 1) The question discussed is whether the Vidyās, Vaiśvānara-Vidyā and others, mentioned in different recensions under the same name, are to be regarded as identical or different.

[419] The Pūrvapakṣin says that (1) a different context, and (2) the repetition of the same matter in different Śākhās point out to विधेयभेद (difference of procedure). The विधेयभेद must lead to विद्याभेद. The followers of Atharvaveda have to observe the Śirovrata (carrying the vessel containing

the sacred fire on their head) when they are being taught the Brahmavidyā. This implies that the Vidyā taught to them is different; if the Vidyā were to be same, the Sirovrata would have to be observed by students of other Vedas or recensions also.

The Siddhānta is :—The Vaiśvānara-Vidyā referred to is the same; for, (1) the injunctions उपासीत, विद्यात् , (2) the connection with the fruit Brahmaprāpti, (3) the general form and (4) the name, are the same pointing out to the Vaiśvānara-Vidyā being recognised as the same one described in the various recensions.

(Sūtra 2) विधेयभेद due to पुन श्रुति and प्रकरणान्तर is not the deciding factor to prove विद्याभेद; for, repetition and another context can exist in one and the same Vidyā, when the Pratipattrs (learners) are different; when the learner is the same, विधेयभेद has to be understood as pointing out to विद्याभेद, there being no other alternative.

[420] (Sūtra 3) The Śirovrata is associated with the study of the Vedic section; it is a वेदव्रत (not विद्याव्रत): this is made clear in the Samācāra (nothing is known about a work of this name), and competency (Adhikāra) also corroborates this view. Similarly, the different sacrifices (सप्त सौर्यादय शतौदनपर्यन्ता:) are associated with the Ātharvaṇa fire called Ekarśi, and not with the Tretā fires, in conformity with the context. In short, ब्रह्मविद्या means वेदविद्य here.

(Sūtra 4) All the Vedāntas speak of the worship or Upāsana. The Paramātman possessed of eight attributes अपहतपाप्मत्व etc., is mentioned in the *Chāndogya* and is referred to in the *Taittiriya.*

So, it is established that the Vidyā referred to in another recension is the same, owing to the attributes being considered together.

According to Śaṅkara, though Brahman is one and Ekarūpa, the question about Vidyābheda arises, because the Vidyās are concerned with Saguṇa Brahman and Prāṇa.

विद्याभेद is caused by (1) नामभेद, (2) रूपभेद, (3) कर्मभेद, and (4) धर्मविशेष. The अभेद is understood from (1) चोदना, (2) प्रयोजनसंयोग, (3) रूप and (4) समाख्या.

But, asks the objector, what are we to do when the Vājasaneyins mention the *sixth fire* in the पञ्चाग्निविद्या, while the Chandogas stick to the five fires? The answer is — It is possible to have गुणभेद in one and the same Vidyā; for instance, the Atirātra sacrifice does not become different, because the Ṣodaśi offering is gone through by some, and not by others. The Vidyā is recognised to be the same easily enough.

The Śirovrata is a स्वाध्यायधर्म as described in the Samācāra; it is not a विद्याधर्म, as the seven Savas (Saurya and others) are concerned only with the Ātharvaṇa fire and not with the Tretā fires which are connected with the स्वाध्यायविशेष in other recensions

Passages like सर्वे वेदा यत्पदमामनन्ति show that the various Upāsanās do contain a censure of भेद, and विधेकत्व is the theme of Vedāntas in general.

(Sūtra 5) Though the Upāsana as such is the same in all Vedāntas, the atttributes in different recensions have to be considered together, as they serve the purpose of elucidating the Vidyā, just as the injunction does. च is used in the sense of अवधारण.

Saṅkara takes this Sūtra as constituting a separate Adhikaraṇa, calling it a प्रयोजनसूत्र. Just as the Agnihotra-attributes are taken together, because the Agnihotra-Karman is the same; so, the विद्यागुणs also, obliging the same Vidyā must be made applicable to the Vidyā.

[420 A] (Sūtra 6) The second Adhikaraṇa comprises five Sūtras.

Udgīthavidyā is the matter under discussion. Both the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* and the *Chāndogya* deal with it.

(1) The Vājins enjoin प्राणदृष्टि upon the Udgītha for securing the defeat of the enemies. The Chandogas do the same. (2) There is no explicit injunction here like उपासीत, विद्यात् etc., but वेदन which is described as the means for the fruit, serves the purpose of the injunction.

The Pūrvapakṣin says—The Vidyās in the two recensions are one and same, because—

(1) there is the same प्राणदृष्टि on the Udgītha which is the object of worship.

(2) the injunction is the same,

(3) the fruit viz. the defeat of the enemies, and

(4) the name Udgīthavidyā are the same.

It is wrong to say that the Vidyās are different on account of Rūpabheda —In the *Bṛha* the प्राणदृष्टि is on the singer of the Udgītha; in the *Chāndogya*, it is on the उद्गानकर्मन् — for, the Upakrama refers to the defeat of the enemies in both. We can understand उद्गानकर्मन् as showing सौकर्य, as the expression ओदनः पच्यते (where the Karman is described as the Kartṛ) does. All this shows that the Vidyās in the two recensions are the same.

(उद्गीथ is the second part of the five-fold Sāman which is to be sung by the Udgātṛ. But in the present context, Udgītha must be taken to mean Udgātṛ, the singer himself, as the expression त्वं न उद्गाय repeated several times clearly shows.

The gods successively approached Vāk, Prāṇa, Cakṣus, Srotra and Manas to perform the duties of the Udgātṛ. The Asuras in order to frustrate the designs of the gods managed to make Vāk etc., associated with sin (by rendering Vāk obscene, false etc., that is, the सूनृता वाक् which alone would have yielded the desired fruit, was converted into राक्षसी वाक्). The gods ultimately secured the Chief Prāṇa (आसन्यम्–आस्ये भवम्. residing in the mouth) to discharge the functions of the Udgātṛ and were victorious).

आखर्ण—a clod of earth, आखन्यते, इति, what is dug out (the form is Vedic, आखनं would be the correct form according to Pāṇini).

The *Bṛha* says तेभ्य एष प्राण उद्गायत; here Prāṇa is definitely the Kartṛ, but in view of the Upakrama, Udgītha has to be taken to be the Kartṛ.

[422] (Sūtra 7) The Siddhānta is :—

The Vidyās are different, because the context is different. The *Chāndogya* advocates the worship of Pranava (Omkāra) as *part* of the Udgītha, while the *Bṛha* advocates the worship of the *entire* Udgītha; difference of context necessitates the difference of Vidheya, and Rūpabheda follows as a corollary. The Upāsya for the Chandogas is the Praṇava; for the Vājins, it is the Udgātṛ (the singer of the Udgītha). There is no contradiction here in respect of the Upakrama, because the Udgātṛ implies the Udgāna-Karman which gives the fruit, the defeat of the enemies. Thus, though the injunction is the same, Rūpabheda involves Vidyābheda.

Even in one and the same recension, though there is Vidhānasāmya, the injunction advocating हिरण्मयपुरुषदृष्टि is regarded as different from the injunction advocating दृष्टि on the Paramātman, characterised by the attributes, — higher than the best (वरीयसां परः — परोवरीयः) etc.

(Sūtra 8) The sameness of the name Udgīthavidyā does not count for much, as it can be there even if Vidheyabheda exists; for instance, the name Agnihotra is applicable to the daily fire-sacrifice, and also to the Ayanāgnihotra (lasting for a month) of the Kuṇḍapāyins (who employ a Kuṇḍa, bowl for drinking). The expression Udgīthavidyā is used in the *Chāndogya* to refer to several Vidyās in the first chapter.

(Sūtra 9) In the first chapter of the *Chāndogya*, the Upāsya Praṇava introduced first, is the same described in the later Vidyās; so, it is fair to say that the Udgītha which comes in the middle of the Section should refer to the Praṇava (a part of the Udgītha). It is usual to use a समुदायशब्द in the sense of part; दग्धः पटः is used even when only a portion of the piece of cloth is burnt.

In the *Bṛha*, the Upāsya is the Udgātṛ who is the Katṛ in respect of the entire Udgītha.

Therefore, the two Vidyās are different.

According to Saṅkara, Sūtras 6–8 form the third Adhikaraṇa. He explains प्रकरणभेदात् as प्रक्रमभेदात्.

His comments on Sūtra 8 are :—

प्रसिद्धभेदानामप्यग्निहोत्रदर्शपूर्णमासादीनां काठकैकग्रन्थपठितानां काठकसंज्ञैकत्वं दृश्यते, तथेहापि भविष्यति यत्र तु नास्ति कश्चिदेवंजातीयको भेदहेतुस्तत्र भवतु संज्ञैकत्वाद्विद्यैकत्वं यथा संवर्गविद्यादिषु ।

Śaṅkara takes Sūtra 9 as forming a separate Adhikaraṇa. The passage discussed is ओमित्येतदक्षरमुद्गीथमुपासीत. Four explanations are possible in the case of the सामानाधिकरण्य of ओम् and उद्गीथ — (1) अध्यास, (2) अपवाद, (3) एकत्व, and (4) विशेषणत्व. The Siddhānta is that the विशेषणपक्ष is the right one to be accepted — च शब्दोऽयं तुस्थाननिवेशी पक्षत्रयव्यावर्तनप्रयोजनः। ... व्याप्तेः सर्ववेदसाधारण्यात्। सर्वव्याप्यक्षरमिह मा प्रसञ्जीत्यत उद्गीथशब्देनाक्षरं विशेष्यते, कथं नामोद्गीथावयवभूत ओंकारो गृह्येतेति। ... समुदायेषु प्रवृत्ताः शब्दा अवयवेष्वपि प्रवर्तमाना दृष्टाः पटग्रामादिषु। अतश्च व्याप्तेर्हेतोरोमित्येतदक्षरमित्येतस्योद्गीथमित्येतद्विशेषणमिति समञ्जसमेतत् ... ।

[423] (Sūtra 10) This Adhikaraṇa contains only one Sūtra.

In the Prāṇa-Vidyā described in the *Chāndogya* and *Bṛha*, Prāṇa is credited with the possession of the attributes ज्यैष्ठ्य (being the eldest) and श्रैष्ठ्य (being the most eminent), and also वसिष्ठत्व (being the richest) etc., connected with the sense-organs. The *Kauṣitaki* does not so describe Vasiṣṭhatva etc.

The objector says that here is obviously Rūpabheda; therefore, the Vidyās are different.

The Siddhānta is—We must understand the attributes Vasiṣṭhatva etc. as being connected with the Prāṇavidyā in the *Kauṣītaki*, because the entire set up of the Prāṇa-episode is the same — the quarrel amongst the Prāṇas; the withdrawal of Vāk etc., one by one; the helplessness of the sense-organs on the departure of Prāṇa from the body, and the pronouncement that Prāṇa was the best etc. The *Kauṣītaki* mentions Vasisthatva as belonging to Vāk and others, to prove the pre-eminent nature of Prāṇa. It does not expressly describe Vasiṣṭhatva etc., as associated with Prāṇa, but that is obvious, as Prāṇa is the cause of Vāk and others possessing those attributes.

[Prāṇa is there in the womb from the very beginning, the sense-organs come into existence later; so Prāṇa is Jyeṣṭha, and also Sreṣtha as the functions of the sense-organs depend upon him.

Vāk has Vasiṣṭhatva; it is generally conceded that a good speaker becomes successful in the world.

Cakṣus has Pratiṣṭhā, as the eye is equally at home, while looking on high and low ground.

Srotra has Sampat, as the ear has the good fortune of being able to listen to the Vedas and to appreciate their meaning.

Manas is the Āyatana, as it alone enjoys the knowledge derived from the various sense-organs.

The sense-organs being dependent on Prāṇa candidly admitted that their functions were really the work of Prāṇa and acknowledged his supremacy].

So, the Vidyās are not different.

Saṅkara remarks — एकस्यामपि हि शाखायां श्रुता गुणाः श्रुता एव सर्वत्र भवन्ति, गुणवतो भेदाभावात्। न हि देवदत्तः शौर्यादिगुणत्वेन स्वदेशे प्रसिद्धो देशान्तरं गतस्तद्देश्यैरविभावितशौर्यादिगुणोऽप्यतद्गुणो भवति। ... तस्मादेकप्रधानसंबद्धा धर्मा एकत्राप्युच्यमानाः सर्वत्रैवोपसंहर्तव्या इति।

[424] (Sūtra 11) The fourth Adhikaraṇa contains seven Sūtras (11-17) — According to Saṅkara, Sūtras 11-13, 14-15 and 16-17 form three separate Adhikaraṇas.

The question is whether the natural (Svarūpa) attributes of Brahman are to be taken up in all the Brahmavidyās.

The objector says that only those attributes which are mentioned in a particular context are relevant in that context.

The Siddhānta is that Brahman (the principal entity) being the same, all its attributes have to be included everywhere.

[425] (Sūtra 12) The objector says — If the Siddhānta view is accepted, attributes like प्रियशिरस्त्व (having Priya as the head) spoken of in the *Taittiriya* would have to be taken as Brahmaguṇas.

The answer is — Priyaśirastva etc., are not the attributes of Brahman; they are only metaphorically attributed to Brahman described as having a human form. Otherwise, Brahman would be possessed of parts, and subject to increase and decrease, which is contradicted by the Sruti, सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म.

Śaṅkara remarks — न चैते प्रियशिरस्त्वादयो ब्रह्मधर्माः, कोशधर्मास्त्वेते...अपि च परस्मिन्ब्रह्मणि चित्तावतारोपायमात्रत्वेनैते परिकल्प्यन्ते, न द्रष्टव्यत्वेन ... सत्यप्युपास्यस्य ब्रह्मण एकत्वे, प्रक्रमभेदादुपासनाभेदे सति नान्योन्यधर्माणामन्योन्यत्रप्राप्तिः । यथा च द्वे नार्यावेकं नृपतिमुपासते, छत्रेणैका चामरेण चान्या, तत्रोपास्यैकत्वेऽप्युपासनाभेदो धर्मव्यवस्था च भवति, एवमिहापीति । उपचितापचितगुणत्वं हि सति भेदव्यवहारे सगुणे ब्रह्मण्युपपद्यते, न निर्गुणे परस्मिन्ब्रह्मणि ।

Both Rāmānuja and Śaṅkara agree that प्रधानस्य means ब्रह्मणः; आनन्द etc., are the स्वरूपगुणs of Brahman according to Rāmānuja. The word प्रधान suggests that there is some अप्रधान feature of Brahman which can be associated with Priyaśirastva etc. This almost looks like the sanctioning by the Sūtrakāra of the Para and Apara divisions of Brahman referred to by Śaṅkara.

[426] (Sūtra 13) As regards the attributes Ānanda etc., they are to be included everywhere as they are capable of pointing out to the real nature of Brahman.

अर्थसमाना :— अर्थप्रतीत्यनुबन्धिनः (Rāmānuja); अर्थसामान्यात्प्रतिपाद्यस्य ब्रह्मणो धर्मिण एकत्वात् (Śaṅkara).

[427] (Sūtra 14) The metaphorical description of Brahman as having a human form, and the attributes Priyaśirastva etc., are for the purpose of meditation alone, there being no other justification for the same.

According to Śaṅkara, the passage under discussion is—इन्द्रियेभ्यः परा ह्यर्थाः... पुरुषान्न परं किंचित् from the *Kāṭhaka*, and the question is whether the various entities referred to therein, are to be understood as superior to or beyond the preceding ones, or only the Puruṣa as the supreme of all. The Siddhānta is that पुरुषः सर्वेभ्यः परः is the thesis which alone points out to the right knowledge No purpose is served by understanding the various entities as superior or otherwise.

(Sūtra 15) The word Ātman expressly shows that the पुरुषविधत्व is metaphorical, as Ātman cannot have any head, wings etc.

Śaṅkara says that the Purusa is called Ātman (एष सर्वेषु भूतेषु गूढोत्मा न प्रकाशते) for the purpose of conveying the idea of the Highest Place.

(Sūtra 16) The word Ātman in the passage (अन्योऽन्तर आत्मा, आनन्दमयः) means the Paramātman, as in other passages like आत्मा वा इदमेक एवाग्र आसीत्.

According to Śaṅkara who begins a new Adhikaraṇa here, the passage under discussion is आत्मा वा...स ईक्षत लोकान्नु सृजा इति. The objector says that the

Lokasrstı can belong only to the Ātman, the Paramātman being connected with the Mahābhūtasrstı to start with The Siddhānta is—The Paramātman is meant here in conformity with other Sruti-passages like तस्माद्वा एतस्मादात्मन आकाश सम्भूत Where some particular feature like ' having a human form ' is actually mentioned, there may be some justification in understanding Ātman as some one other than the Paramātman

उत्तरात् — आनन्दमयविशेषात् वाक्यात् (Rāmānuja), उत्तरस्मुपलभ्यते, ' स ऐक्षत लोकान्नु सृजा इति ' इत्येवमादि, तस्मात् (Sankara)

[428] (Sūtra 17) In the passages प्राणमय मनोमय , etc , also, it can be emphatically stated that the Paramātmabuddhi is there The next sentence सोऽकामयत shows that the word Ātman is to be explained as Paramātman (Rāmānuja seems to give this as an alternative interpretation of उत्तरात् in the last Sūtra)

Sankara — Only on the supposition that the Paramātman is meant here, that the परमात्मैकत्व emphatically stated prior to creation, can be justified, (लोकसृष्टिवचनं तु श्रुत्यन्तरप्रसिद्धमहाभूतसृष्ट्यन्तरमिति योजयिष्यामि श्रुत्यन्तरसिद्धो हि समानविषयो विशेष श्रुत्यन्तरेषूपसंहर्तव्यो भवति ।)

Sankara gives also an alternative interpretation of the two Sūtras 16 and 17 — The two passages in the *Brha* योऽयं विज्ञानमय प्राणेषु and स वा एष महानज आत्मा , show ब्रह्मात्मता similarly, the two passages in the *Chāndogya* सदेव सोम्येदमग्र and तत्त्वमसि describe तादात्म्य – The objector says that the two sets of passages are अतुल्यार्थ, the answer is they are तुल्यार्थ, उत्तरात् means तादात्म्यापदेशात् सर्वमेतत् तादात्म्यप्रतिपादनायामेवावकल्पते, न तादात्म्यसंपादनायाम् । तस्मादेवजातीयकेषु वाक्येषु प्रतिपादनप्रकारभेदेऽपि प्रतिपाद्यार्थाभेद इति सिद्धम् ।

[429] (Sūtra 18) Both Sankara and Rāmānuja take this Sūtra as forming a separate Adhikarana

The *Brha* and the *Chāndogya* refer to the sipping of water (Ācamana) before and after eating food, the water sipped is credited with furnishing clothing for the naked fire or Prana

The question is whether the sipping of water is enjoined here (आचामेत् is optative, and so विधिप्रत्यय is there), and अनग्नं कुरुते (no विधिप्रत्यय here) implies only glorification

The Pūrvapaksin's view is that as Ācamana can be understood from the Smrtis as a part of the normal procedure, Ācamana cannot be the subject of an injunction

[430] The Siddhānta is—The clothing of the fire with water—which is an Apūrva thing is enjoined here, because the Sāstra can be significant if only some Apūrva or Aprāpta is referred to (कार्याख्यानात् अप्राप्तख्यानात्) Ācamana is Prāpta from the Smrtis the Aprāpta प्राणवासस्त्वानुसंधान is enjoined here in the case of the water sipped

Rāmānuja regards this Sūtra as a continuation of Sūtra 10 (Sūtras 11–17 being regarded as dealing with प्रासङ्गिक matter).

According to Sankara, the question discussed is whether both Ācamana and Anagnatācintana are enjoined, or if only one, which one?

The Pūrvapakṣin says — Both Ācamana and Anagnatāsaṁkīrtana should be regarded as enjoined. I take both of them to be Apūrva; or Ācamana is enjoined and the other is merely for glorification.

The Siddhānta is — Ācamana is not enjoined, as it is not entitled to be called Apūrva, being well-known in the Smṛtis; neither can the present passage be taken as the basis of the Smṛti-description, because here the Sruti is concerned with Prāṇavidyā, while the Smṛti deals with the Ācamana in a general way for ensuring purity or cleanliness (न च भिन्नविषययोः श्रुतिस्मृत्योर्मूलमूलिभावोऽवकल्पते). There cannot be two injunctions either; in that case there would be वाक्यभेद which is a serious blemish to be avoided at all costs. It is therefore better to say that परिधानदृष्टि is enjoined upon the water the sipping of which is well-known.)

[431] (Sūtra 19) The sixth Adhikaraṇa contains only one Sūtra.

Śāṇḍilya-vidyā is described twice by the Vājasaneyins — in the Agnirahasya Section, and later on in the *Bṛha* proper, with some additional attributes. Here in both places, Saṁyoga, Codanā, Nāman etc., are the same; only the उपास्यगुण differ.

The Pūrvapakṣin says that उपास्यगुणभेद means रूपभेद and रूपभेद shows विद्याभेद.

The Siddhānta is — The two Vidyās are the same, because the Upāsya is the same.

Sankara — यथा भिन्नासु शाखासु विद्यैकत्वं गुणोपसंहारश्च भवति, एवमेकस्यामपि शाखायां भवितुमर्हति, उपास्याभेदात् ।

[432] (Sūtra 20) The seventh Adhikaraṇa contains three Sūtras.

In the *Bṛha* Satya-Brahman is described as Upāsya existing in the orb of the Sun, with its secret Adhidaivata name अहः, and in the right eye, with its secret Adhyātma name अहम्.

The question is whether the two secret names are to be associated with both the places or not.

The Pūrvapakṣin says that as the Upāsya is the same, the Vidyā is the same, and so, there ought to be Guṇopasaṁhāra in both cases.

Sankara — एका हीयं सत्यविद्या, अधिदैवमध्यात्मं चाधीता, उपक्रमाभेदात्, व्यतिषक्तपाठाच्च । कथं तस्यामुदितो धर्मस्तस्यामेव न स्यात्? यो ह्याचार्ये कश्चिदनुगमनादिराचारश्चोदितः स ग्रामगतेऽरण्यगते च तुल्यवदेव भवति ।

[433] (Sūtra 21) The Siddhānta is — Here is उपास्यरूपविशेषः the स्थानs are different; so, there is विद्याभेद (in the case of the Sāṇḍilya-vidyā, the उपास्यस्थान is the same).

Sankara — एकस्यापि स्थानविशेषोपादानेनैव, उपनिषद्विशेषोपदेशात्, तत्स्थस्यैव सा भवितुमर्हति । अस्ति चायं दृष्टान्तः — सत्यप्याचार्यस्वरूपानपाये यदाचार्यस्यासीनस्यानुवर्तनमुक्तं न तत्तिष्ठतो भवति, यच्च तिष्ठत उक्तं न तदासीनस्येति । ग्रामारण्ययोस्त्वाचार्यस्वरूपानपायात्, तत्स्वरूपानुबद्धस्य च धर्मस्य ग्रामारण्यकृतविशेषाभावादुभयत्र तुल्यवद्भाव, इत्यदृष्टान्तः सः ।

(Sūtra 22) The passage तस्यैतस्य तदेव रूपं यदमुष्य रूपं furnishes the reason why there is no गुणोपसंहार where the आधार is different (which means that there is विद्याभेद). If there is विदोष्य, अतिदेश has no scope. But here is अतिदेश (extension of the rule) in respect of Rūpa etc.

Sankara — अक्ष्यादित्यस्थानभेदभिन्नान्धर्मान्, अन्योन्यस्मिन्नुपसंहार्यान् पश्यन्, इहातिदेशेनादित्यपुरुषगतान् रूपादीनक्षिपुरुष उपसंहरति 'तस्यैतस्य तदेव रूपम्' इत्यादिना।

[434] (Sūtra 23) The eighth Adhikaraṇa contains only one Sūtra.

The question is whether the attributes वीर्यसंभृति, द्युव्याप्ति referred to in respect of Brahman, are to be associated with all Vidyās.

The Siddhānta is — They cannot obviously be considered in all Vidyās. द्युव्याप्ति and वीर्यसंभृति cannot surely be connected with Vidyās associated with अल्पस्थानs.

संभृतिद्युव्याप्ति is a समाहारद्वन्द्व compound.

Sankara remarks — अत एव चायतनविशेषयोगात्। ... समानगुणाम्नानेन हि प्रत्युपस्थापितासु विप्रकृष्टदेशास्वपि विद्यासु विप्रकृष्टदेशा गुणा उपसंह्रियेरन्निति युक्तम्। ... तस्मात्, वीर्यसंभृत्यादीनां शाण्डिल्यविद्यादिष्वनुपसंहार इति।

[435] (Sūtra 24) Only one Sūtra in the ninth Adhikaraṇa

The question is whether the Puruṣavidyā in the *Taittirīya* (where is described the Puruṣa-sacrifice) and that in the *Chāndogya* (where the fruit वर्षशतं जीवति is given) are the same.

The Pūrvapakṣin says — The two पुरुषविद्याs are one, as they are called by the same name, and there is रूपैक्य also inasmuch as the limbs of a human being are compared to the parts of a sacrifice.

[436] The Siddhānta is — The Vidyās are different; the special attributes mentioned in one are not found in the other. Thus—

Taittirīya	*Chāndogya*
(1) The three Savanas (सायं प्रातर्मध्यन्दिनं) are mentioned.	The सवनत्व refers to a man's life.
(2) There is no दीक्षाकल्पन of अशिशिषा etc.	दीक्षाकल्पन is mentioned.
(3) Ātman is spoken of as Yajamāna, Śraddhā as his wife etc.	No such description.

So, there is रूपभेद; फलसंयोग also is different, the acquisition of Brahman (in the *Taittirīya*) and Āyuṣprāpti (in the *Chāndogya*).

Sankara remarks — यद्यपि किंचिन्मरणावभृथत्वादिसाम्यं, तदप्यल्पीयस्त्वाद्भूयसा वैलक्षण्येनाभिभूयमानं न प्रत्यभिज्ञापनक्षमम्। ... विदुषो यज्ञस्य हि, न चैते समानाधिकरणे षष्ठ्यौ, विद्वानेव यो यज्ञस्तस्येति। ...व्यधिकरणे त्वेते षष्ठ्यौ, विदुषो यो यज्ञस्तस्येति। ...तस्मात्, शाखान्तराधीतानां पुरुषविद्याधर्माणामाशीर्मन्त्रादीनामप्राप्तिस्तैत्तिरीयके।

[437] (Sūtra 25) Only one Sūtra in the tenth Adhikaraṇa.

The question is whether the different introductory Mantras शुक्रं प्रविध्य, शं नो मित्रः etc., and the Karmans, Pravargya etc., are parts of the Vidyā (विद्याङ्ग) or not.

The Pūrvapakṣin says—As these are found in the same संनिधि, and as some of the Mantras are not found elsewhere, they should all be taken as विद्याङ्ग.

[438] The Siddhānta is—The Mantras in question cannot be Vidyāṅga; they are employed in Vedic study, Abhicāra-karman etc., and so they are subsidiary to the study-injunction. They are mentioned in the Vidyā-section, not because they are Vidyāṅga, but because, like the Upanisads they are to be recited by day (not by night) and are to be taught in a forest (not at the house).

Śaṅkara remarks — एवमन्येषामपि मन्त्राणां केषांचिल्लिङ्गेन, केषाचिद्वचनेन, केषांचित्प्रमाणान्तरेण, इत्येवमर्थान्तरेषु विनियुक्तानां रहस्यपठितानामपि सतां न संनिधिमात्रेण विद्याशेषत्वोपपत्तिः । दुर्बलो हि संनिधिः श्रुत्यादिभ्य इत्युक्तं प्रथमे तन्त्रे...तथा कर्मणामपि प्रवर्ग्यादीनामन्यत्र विनियुक्तानां न विद्याशेषत्वोपपत्तिः । ...अरण्यानुवचनादिधर्मसामान्यात्तु संनिधिपाठ इति संतोष्टव्यम् ।

[439] (Sūtra 26) Only one Sūtra in the eleventh Adhikaraṇa.

The knower of Vidyā is said in some Sruti-passages to secure Brahman, or Paramasāmya (highest similarity) with it, by abandoning his sinful deeds, or both meritorious and sinful deeds; other passages speak of the good deeds and sinful deeds being shared respectively by friends (or dear relatives) and by enemies (or undesirable relatives).

The question is whether all these ideas are to be clubbed together, and form part of all Vidyās.

[440] The Siddhānta is—All these must be taken together. Hāna (abandonment) implies Upāyana (taking up) and vice versa (so as to ensure that the original position is not changed, and there is no vacuum—One may ask, however, why this is necessary at all) and so, even if these ideas occur in different sections, they must be considered together. To understand these as being optional is but the last resort, when there is no other alternative. To take a similar instance, the Kauṣītakins say in a general manner, कुशा वानस्पत्याः (कुशा is a word of the feminine gender); but Śāṭyāyanins particularise the Kuśās as belonging to, or chopped out of the Udumbara tree, and this particularisation is held to be in order. Similarly देवासुराणां छन्दोभिः (where the Chandases are spoken of as referring to the Gods and the Asuras) is interpreted in the light of देवच्छन्दांसि पूर्वम् which points out the order to be followed.

[As far as possible, विकल्प should be avoided, as it is associated with eight blemishes.

A modern student studying at the University, who is accustomed to see options given to almost all questions in his examination paper would be interested to know that the Pūrvamīmāṁsā looks upon Vikalpa or option in the case of an injunction with abhorrence and recommends that Vikalpa is to be avoided at all costs, as it is अष्टदोषग्रस्त.

This is how a Vikalpa is associated with eight blemishes—

We have, suppose, the two injunctions

(A) व्रीहिभिर्यजेत, and

(B) यवैर्यजेत.

Now, all such injunctions in the Karmakāṇḍa are equally authoritative and powerful.

If we take our stand on A, and sacrifice with the Vrīhis, then the following blemishes would result—

(1) Discarding the authority of B.

(2) Acknowledging the अप्रामाण्य of B, by ignoring the injunction there.

To correct our mistake, if we take our stand on B, then the Doṣas are—

(3) Discarding the authority of A.

(4) Acknowledging the अप्रामाण्य of A, by ignoring the injunction there.

Now, believing that we made a mistake in first taking our stand on A, we take our stand first on B, then the Doṣas are—

(5) and (6) } same as 3 and 4 above.

If we change over to A, the two Doṣas would be—

(7) and (8) } same as 1 and 2 above.

Thus there are eight Doṣas. It would be seen that the craze for analysis in detail produces these eight Doṣas; they can be easily reduced at least to four].

So also, हिरण्येन षोडशिनः स्तोत्रमुपाकरोति, *and* ऋत्विज उपगायन्ति *are to be interpreted* in the light of सूर्ये षोडशिनः, and अनध्वर्युरुपगायेत् respectively.

Sankara — [illegible]
वाग्नुष्ठेयत्वेन संकीर्त्यते, वि[illegible]
नार्थमिदं सूत्रम्। ...तदुक्त[illegible]
अर्थवेतास्वेव विधूननश्रुतिष्वेतेन सूत्रेणैतच्चिन्तयितव्यम्।

[441] (Sūtra 27) The twelfth Adhikaraṇa comprises five Sūtras.

Sankara makes three Adhikaraṇas out of the five Sūtras (27–28; 29–30 and 31).

The question discussed is—When do the giving up and the taking up of good and evil deeds take place—at the time when the body is given up, or when the knower of Vidyā is proceeding by the Devayāna path ?

The Pūrvapakṣin says—The Śruti-passages refer to both the alternatives. It is better to conclude therefore that some portion of the Sukṛta-duṣkṛta is given up at the separation from the body, and the rest while on the journey by the Devayāna.

The Siddhānta is — the Sukṛta-duṣkṛta is given up entirely at the departure from the body; for, there is nothing to be experienced as a result of the Sukṛta-duṣkṛta further on. The attainment to Brahman rules out any other enjoyment. ताण्डिन: are the Chandogas.

(Sūtra 28) The Śruti-passages have to be explained so as not to contradict the above conclusion, and not according to one's will. The shaking away of the Sukṛta-duṣkṛta mentioned in the *Kauṣītaki* on the journey by the Devayāna, must be taken to have happened prior to the journey.

छन्दत:—यथेष्टम् (This is hardly satisfactory; छन्दत: is almost meaningless, and पदानामन्वयो वर्णनीय: has to be supplied). उभयाविरोधात्—श्रुते:, अर्थस्वभावस्य च, अविरोधेन.

Śaṅkara takes उभयाविरोधात् to mean निमित्तनैमित्तिकयोरुपपत्ते: — If Sukrta and Duṣkṛta are abandoned on the way, how could they be destroyed later? Yama, Niyama etc., can not be practised in the absence of the body; their observance is possible only in the state of a Sādhaka.

According to Nimbārka, उभय refers to हान and उपादान (Sukṛta is received by friends, and Duṣkṛta by the enemies, of their free will).

Nimbārka's interpretation suits the context better.

[442] (Sūtra 29) The Pūrvapakṣin argues — The Śruti-passage describing the Devayāna path could be significant only on the supposition that a portion of the Sukrta-duṣkrta is given up at the departure from the body and the remaining portion on the journey itself; otherwise, if the whole of the Sukṛta-duṣkṛta is given up or destroyed at the time of the separation from the body, even the subtle body would not be there, in which case the Ātman with no body at all, can not proceed on the journey.

[According to Śaṅkara this Sūtra does not embody the view of the the Pūrvapakṣin. उभयथा is taken by him to mean अर्थवती (गति:), and न. अर्थवती; *the course of the Devayāna is both significant (for those who go* in for सगुणोपासना) and not significant (in the case of those who secure Brahman straightaway), so that there could be no conflict with the Śruti-passages like निरञ्जन: परमं साम्यमुपैति। While it must be admitted that it is somewhat unusual to speak of the division of गति into अर्थवती and न. अर्थवती, and that the Sūtrakāra does not explicitly refer to the Saguṇa and Nirguṇa Vidyās, Śaṅkara's interpretation is by no means wide of the mark. A general rule, though of universal application, has got to take into account the possibility or otherwise of its being applicable to particular cases. (For instance, there is usually a general rule under which a candidate at an examination is given 'grace marks' under certain circumstances; but this does not apply to a candidate who has already secured a sufficient percentage of marks).

Nimbārka understands उभयथा to mean that both good and evil deeds are, shaken off; otherwise, if the good deeds still remain, there would not be non-return of the Soul, which is specially mentioned by the Śruti.

[illegible]

(Sūtra 30) The Sıddhānta ıs—There ıs the destruction of all Karman, but owıng to the potency of the Vıdyā, the knower ıs provıded wıth the subtle body all the same, as ıs mentioned ın the Srutı (तल्लक्षणार्थ—देहस्य तल्लक्षणार्थं) The Vıdyā mıght not be ıntended for producıng the subtle body, but ıt could do so ıncıdentally (For ınstance, a canal or tank buılt for provıdıng water for purposes of ırrıgatıon, can also supply water for drınkıng, washıng etc)

Sankara's comments—गतिकारणभूतो ह्यर्थ पर्यङ्कविद्यादिषु सगुणेषूपासनेषूपलभ्यते तत्रार्थवती गति । न हि सम्यग्दर्शने तल्लक्षणार्थोपलब्धिरस्ति तत्रानर्थिका गति । लोकवच्चैष विभागो द्रष्टव्य, यथा लोके ग्रामप्राप्तौ देशान्तरप्रापण पन्था अपेक्ष्यते न, आरोग्यप्राप्तौ, एवमिहापीति ।

[443] (Sūtra 31) Sankara reads thıs Sūtra after the next one, and forms two Adhıkaranas of the two

The objector poınts out that ın the case of Vasıstha, Apāntaratamas (an ancıent Vyāsa) and others, a new bırth, a new body etc , have been stated How could thıs be ?

The answer ıs—There are Jñānıns and Jñānıns, the Prārabdha-karman of some requıres them to take another bırth, and they do not go by the Devayāna path

Sankara mentıons besıdes Vasıstha and Apāntaratamas (वेदाचार्य पुराणर्षिर्विष्णुनियोगात् कलिद्वापरयो सधौं कृष्णद्वैपायन सम्बभुव), Bhrgu Sanatkumāra, Daksa, Nārada etc All these act under the orders of the Lord (एवमपान्तरतम प्रभृतयोऽपीश्वरा परमेश्वरेण तेषु तेष्वधिकारेषु नियुक्ता सन्त सत्यपि सम्यग्दर्शने कैवल्यहेतावक्षीणकर्माणो यावदधिकारमव-तिष्ठन्ते तदवसाने चापवृज्यन्त ।)

[444] (Sūtra 32) Rāmānuja takes thıs Sūtra as formıng the thırteenth Adhıkarana and reads सर्वेषां for सर्वासां (whıch ıs Sankara's readıng). श्रद्धा तप इति — श्रद्धा ıs Vedıc for श्रद्धा (or, श्रद्धा तप both can be taken as nom. sıng)

All Upāsananısthas have to go by the Devayāna path, not only those engaged ın Upāsanas where the path ıs actually mentıoned Srutıs and Smrtıs, all agree on thıs poınt

Sankara says that ın certaın Saguna-vıdyās such as Paryanka vıdyā, Upakosala-vıdya Pañcāgnı-vıdyā, Dahara-vıdyā, Gatı ıs actually mentıoned Gatı ıs not mentıoned ın Madhu-vıdyā, Sāndılya vıdyā, Sodaśakala-vıdyā Vaıśvānara-vıdya etc , but ıt ıs clear from Srutı and Smrtı that the Gatı ıs meant for all who know the Saguna-vıdyās

[445] (Sūtra 33) The fourteenth Adhıkarana comprıses two Sūtras Sankara takes Sūtra 33 as formıng a separate Adhıkarana

In the *Brha* and the *Mundaka*, Brahman ıs descrıbed as Aksara, and as one possessıng negatıve qualıtıes, Asthūlatva etc

The questıon ıs whether these negatıve qualıtıes are to be assocıated wıth all Vıdyās, or not

The Pūrvapaksın argues that the negatıve attrıbutes by themselves cannot enable us to understand the true nature of Brahman so they should be assocıated only wıth those Vıdyās where they are actually mentıoned

The Siddhānta is—As Brahman is the same throughout, and as the negative qualities are useful in pointing out its peculiar nature being opposed to what is fit to be abandoned—, all the attributes must be associated with all Vidyās; the Guṇas must be provided with some Guṇin, they cannot be left just hanging in the air, so to speak; for instance, the *Mantra* अग्निर्वै होत्रं वेतु in the Sāmaveda, which is subsidiary to जामदग्न्यचतूरात्रपुरोडाश, is made use of by the followers of the Yajurveda (for recitation silently), as it pertains to the principal Upāsya. Jaimini also says मुख्येन वेदसंयोगः.

(The चतूरात्र sacrifice was instituted by Jamadagni. The *Mantra* अग्निर्वै... is sung loudly when the Puroḍāśa is offered; but it is recited silently, being subordinate to the Upasad mentioned in the Yajurveda. The Ādhāna-karman is the Pradhāna (principal rite) in the Yajurveda, and in conformity with the Pradhāna-rite उपांशुत्व is resorted to there (उपांशु यजुषा). The Puroḍāśa-pradāna is the business of the Adhvaryu concerned with the Yajurveda).

Sankara says—समानो हि सर्वत्र विशेषनिराकरणरूपो ब्रह्मप्रतिपादनप्रकारः। ... प्रपञ्चार्थश्चायं चिन्ताभेदः। ...यथा जामदग्न्येऽहीने पुरोडाशिनीषूपसत्सु चोदितासु पुरोडाशमन्त्राणाम् 'अग्निर्वैहोत्रं वेत्वध्वरम' इत्येवमादीनाम्, उद्गातृवेदोत्पन्नानामपि, अध्वर्युभिरभिसंबन्धो भवति, अध्वर्युकर्तृकत्वात्पुरोडाशप्रदानस्य प्रधानतन्त्रत्वाच्चाङ्गानाम्।

[446] (Sūtra 34) According to Saṅkara, this Sūtra constitutes a separate Adhikaraṇa.

The negative attributes particularise the positive attributes Ānanda etc., and are to be meditated upon; thus alone can the nature of Brahman be differentiated from others. Other attributes Sarvakarmatva etc., may be confined to the particular Vidyās.

The Pūrvapakṣin says—The passages द्वा सुपर्णा... in the *Muṇḍaka* and ऋतं पिबन्तौ ... in the *Katha* refer to different Vidyās, as in the former, one bird is said to be the enjoyer, the other being only the looker on; while in the latter both are said to be enjoyers.

The Siddhānta is—There is विद्यैकत्व (इयदामननात् means इयत्तापरिच्छिन्नं द्वित्वोपेतं वेद्यरूपमभिन्नमामनन्ति). Both these passages describe जीवाद्वितीय-ईश्वर; the context shows that the Paramātman is the वेद्य, and so, there is no विद्याभेद. (प्रपञ्चार्थ एवैष योगः, तस्माच्च, अधिकधर्मोपसंहारः)

[447] (Sūtra 35) The fifteenth Adhikaraṇa comprises two Sūtras

In the *Bṛha*

	Uṣasta asks the question,	the answer given is
	यत्साक्षादपरोक्षाद्ब्रह्म... तन्मे व्याचक्ष्व	यः प्राणेन प्राणिति स त आत्मा...एष त आत्मा सर्वान्तरः, अतोऽन्यदार्तम्।
and	Kahola asks the question	the answer given is
	यदेव साक्षादपरोक्षाद्ब्रह्म...	योऽशनायापिपासे शोकं मृत्युमत्येति... अतोऽन्यदार्तम्।

The Pūrvapakṣin says—There is विद्याभेद here; for, the answers are different, though the question is the same. In the first answer, the Pratyagātman

(who is the Prānitr, and also Sarvāntara, being associated with Bhūtagrāma) is meant, and in the second, the Paramātman.

The Siddhānta is—There is no विद्याभेद. For, the question and answer pertain to the Paramātman alone who is beyond hunger and thirst, who is inside all and who is Prānana-kartr (the Pratyagātman is not Prānitr in Susupti). In both the answers अतोऽन्यदार्तम् occurs, which can only refer to everything else other than the Paramātman, being described as miserable. The repetition of the question and answer is for purpose of showing the unique character and greatness of the Paramātman. In the Śvetaketu-episode, the question (भूय एव मा भगवान् विज्ञापयतु) and the answer (ऐतदात्म्यमिदं सर्वं...तत्त्वमसि) are repeated as many as nine times, still the Vidyā is one

Śankara splits this Sūtra into two Sūtras, अन्तरा भूतग्रामवत्स्वात्मनः is a separate Sūtra.

Śankara says—अन्तरात्मा विशेषात्स्वात्मनो विदेकत्वमिति। सर्वान्तरो हि स्वात्मोभयत्राप्यविशिष्टः पृच्छ्यते च प्रत्युच्यते च। न हि द्वावात्मानावेकस्मिन्देहे सर्वान्तरौ संभवतः।...एकस्य तु भूतग्रामवन्नैव सर्वान्तरत्वं स्यात्...अथवा भूतग्रामवदिति श्रुत्यन्तरं निदर्शयति यथा—एको देवः सर्वभूतेषु गूढः ...उपदेशान्तरवदुपपत्तेः—'स आत्मा तत्त्वमसि श्वेतकेतो' इति नवकृत्वोऽप्युपदेशे न विद्याभेदो भवति...उपक्रमोपसंहाराभ्यामेकार्थावगमात्।

[448] (Sūtra 36) There cannot be विद्याभेद as the question and the answer refer to the same topic, and there is the same injunctive expression (विद्यात्), and the same Upāsya, सर्वान्तरात्मत्वम्. The idea about प्राणनहेतुत्व in Usasta's question has to be incorporated in अशनायायतीतत्व in Kahola's question, and thus both come to know of Brahman being differentiated from Jiva. Similar is the case in the other Sadvidyās in the *Chāndogya.*

Rāmānuja takes इतरवत् to mean practically the same thing as उपदेशवत् in the last Sūtra.

[449] (Sūtra 37) परा देवता expressed by सत् is referred to in other Sruti-passages, and so, the attributes सत्य etc., are to be incorporated there also.

[Śankara takes व्यतिहारो विशिंषन्ति हीतरवत्, and सैव सत्यादयः as forming two separate Adhikaranas. The विषयवाक्यs are—तद्योऽहं सोऽसौ .. in the *Aitareya*, and त्वं वा अहमस्मि .. *in the Jābāla. The question is whether the* मति referred to here is उभयरूपा or एकरूपा.

The Pūrvapaksin says that the मति is एकरूपा. The व्यतिहार is intended for strengthening the एकत्वमति.

The Siddhānta is—व्यतिहारोऽयमाध्यानायाम्नायते, इतरवत्। यथेतरे गुणाः सर्वात्मत्वप्रभृतय आध्यानायाम्नायन्ते तद्वत्।

सैव सत्यादयः—The विषयवाक्यs are, स यो हैतं महद्यक्षं ... and तद्यत्तत्सत्यमसौ स आदित्यः, in the *Brha.*

The question is whether two Satya-vidyās are described here or only one.

The Siddhānta is—Only one Vidyā is referred to, तद्यत्तत्सत्यम्, इति प्रकृताकर्षणात्

Sankara further says—केचित्पुनरस्मिन्सूत्रे, इदं च वाजसनेयकमक्ष्यादित्यपुरुषविषयं वाक्यं, छान्दोग्ये च, अथ य एषोऽन्तरादित्ये हिरण्मयः पुरुषो दृश्यते, अथ य एषोऽक्षिणि पुरुषो दृश्यते, इत्युदाहृत्य

सैवेयमक्ष्यादित्यपुरुषाविषया विद्या, उभयमेकैवेति कृत्वा सत्यादीन्गुणान् वाजसनेयिभ्यश्छन्दोगानामुपसंहार्यान्मन्यन्ते। तत्र साधु लक्ष्यते। छान्दोग्ये हि...कर्मसंबन्धिचिह्नानि भवन्ति...नैवं वाजसनेयके किंचित्कर्मसंबन्धि चिह्नमस्ति। तस्मात् प्रक्रमभेदाद्विद्याभेदे सति गुणव्यवस्थैव युक्तेति।]

Rāmānuja attacks the arrangement and interpretation by Saṅkara, of the two Sūtras. He says that as the Sarvātmabhāva is already known from तत्त्वमसि etc., nothing remains to be known by 'the व्यवहारानुसंधान in the passages अहं वै त्वमसि and तद्योऽहं सोऽसौ etc. There can not be उपासनैक्य in स यो ह वै तन्महद्यक्षं .. and तद्यत्सत्यमसौ स आदित्यः..., because there is स्थानभेद (अक्षि and आदित्य). There is the fault of mutual interdependence (इतरेतराश्रयत्व),—if we hold there is एकविद्यात्व, then the पूर्वफल is प्रधान, and the उत्तरफल is subsidiary; when the प्रधानगुणभाव is understood, then there is विद्यैक्य.

[450] (Sūtra 38) The sixteenth Adhikarana comprises two Sūtras. The Pūrvapakṣin says that in the *Chāndogya* Akāśa characterised by the eight attributes is the Upāsya, in the *Bṛha*, one abiding in the Akāśa, possessing the attributes वशित्व etc., is the Upāsya. So, there is रूपभेद and consequently विद्याभेद.

The Siddhānta is—There is no रूपभेद. The same Brahman which is elsewhere described as having the attributes सत्यकामत्व etc., is described in both places, as is clear from its being हृदयायतन, सेतु etc. Attributes वशित्व etc., are but the particular features of Satyasamkalpatva etc. The fruit—acquisition of Brahman—is the same. It has already been proved in I·3·13, that Ākāśa in the *Chāndogya*-passage means Brahman; in the *Bṛha*, Ākāśa means the void in the heart.

Śaṅkara—कामादीति सत्यकामादीत्यर्थः। यथा देवदत्तो दत्तः, सत्यभामा भामेति। ...सगुणा हि ब्रह्मविद्या छान्दोग्य उपदिश्यते...वाजसनेयके तु निर्गुणमेव परं ब्रह्मोपदिश्यमानं दृश्यते...वशित्वादि तु तत्स्तुत्यर्थमेव गुणजातं...गुणवतस्तु ब्रह्मण एकत्वाद्विभूतिप्रदर्शनाय गुणोपसंहारः सूत्रितो नोपासनायेति द्रष्टव्यम्।

Though there is no explicit reference to the division—Saguṇa and Nirguṇa—in the passages, Śaṅkara's interpretation strikes as logically convincing.

[451] (Sūtra 39) The Śruti-passages mention the various attributes of the Upāsya Brahman with respect, and condemn their अवेदन; they also emphasise Brahman's glory now and then Passages like अग्राह्यो न गृह्यते show that Brahman is प्रपञ्चविलक्षण, as it cannot be known by any other Pramāṇa.

[Śaṅkara takes this Sūtra and the next one as forming a separate Adhikarana.

The विषयवाक्य is from the Vaiśvānara-vidyā in the *Chāndogya* तद्यद्भक्तं प्रथमामागच्छेत्तद्धोमीयं ... प्राणाय स्वाहा, followed by य एतदेवं विद्वानग्निहोत्रं जुहोति.

The question is whether there is the लोप of Prāṇāgnihotra, when the Bhojana is over.

The Pūrvapakṣin says there is no Bhojanalopa as another Śruti in the same place makes the Svāmi-bhojana the principal thing, and so, Agnihotra-lopa is out of question ... भक्तद्रव्यैकतागुणविशेषविधानार्थमिदं वाक्यं तद्यद्भक्तमिति। अतो गुणलोपे न मुख्यस्येत्येवं प्राप्तम्। भोजनलोपेऽप्यद्भिर्वान्येन वा द्रव्येणाविरुद्धेन प्रतिनिधानन्यायेन प्राणाग्निहोत्रस्यानुष्ठानमिति।]

[452] (Sūtra 40) When the Pratyagātman is merged into Brahman, his movement at will is described in the Śruti, and that is the fruit fit for being enjoyed by the Released one; so, the attributes सत्यकामत्व etc., have to be associated with him.

[This is the Siddhānta-sūtra according to Śaṅkara — उपस्थिते भोजनेऽन्नस्तस्मादेव भोजनद्रव्यात्प्रथमोपनिपातात् प्राणाग्निहोत्रं निवर्तितव्यम् । ... भोजनपक्ष एवैते मन्त्रद्रव्यदेवतासंयोगात्स्य होमा निर्वर्तयितव्याः । गत्त्वादरदर्शनवचनं तद्भोजनपक्षे प्राथम्यविधानार्थम् । ... तस्माद्भोजनलोपे लोप एव प्राणाग्निहोत्रस्येति ।]

While Rāmānuja takes Sūtras 40–41 as a continuation of the sixteenth Adhikarana, Śaṅkara takes them as concerned with quite another problem–where there is Prāṇāgnihotralopa when there is Bhojanalopa. It is difficult to discover what was in the mind of the Sūtrakāra, It is clear, however, *that Rāmānuja's interpretation practically covers the same ground* as was covered by the preceding Sūtras.

[453] (Sūtra 41) Both Rāmānuja and Śaṅkara take this Sūtra as forming a separate Adhikaraṇa, and the विषयवाक्य, ओमित्येतदक्षरमुद्गीथमुपासीत...is the same.

The Pūrvapakṣin says that the Udgīthopāsanā etc., being कर्माङ्गाश्रय, and having a separate fruit indicated by the passage यदेव विद्यया करोति...तदेव वीर्यवत्तरं भवति, must be, as a rule, gone through; just as the Anuṣṭhāna is gone through, with the ladle *made of leaves having a separate fruit — not hearing any* calumny.

The Siddhānta is — There can be no rule that the meditation on the Udgītha etc, has to be gone through in the case of Karmans; for Karmans are spoken of in connection with both the wise and the non-wise.

Upāsanāvidhi is the principal here, and must have a separate fruit viz. heaven, other than the Karmaphala (वीर्यवत्तर means 'capable of flouting the karmaphala').

कर्माङ्गाश्रय*s have a separate* Phala, *and so they can not* be associated with Upāsanās as a rule, like the Godohana in the sacrifice. रात्रिसत्रन्याय — Even if there is no mention of the fruit in the injunction-sentence proper, the Vidhi-vākya is competent to refer to the fruit — रात्रीरुपेयात् is on injunction-sentence not mentioning the fruit, but the fruit प्रतिष्ठा is to be associated with it, considering the glorificatory passage प्रतितिष्ठन्ति ह वा एते... गोदोहनादिवत्—गोदोहनेन पशुकामस्य प्रणयेत् is the Vidhi-vākya (Godohana—the vessel used for milking the cow) which enjoins only one who is desirous of securing cattle, to bring the water in the Godohana-vessel. One who is not Paśukāma may bring the water in any manner he likes. Godohana is not a necessary adjunct for the sacrificial Karman.

Śaṅkara says—यथा क्रत्वाश्रयाण्यपि गोदोहनादीनि फलसंयोगादनित्यानि, एवमुद्गीथाद्युपासनान्यपीति द्रष्टव्यम् । अत एव च कल्पसूत्रकारा नैवंजातीयकान्युपासनानि क्रतुषु कल्पयांचक्रुः ।

[454] (Sūtra 42) Both Rāmānuja and Śankara take this Sūtra as forming a separate Adhikaraṇa.

In the *Chāndogya*, the meditation on Daharākāśa as the Paramātman is described and also the Upāsanā of the attributes Satyakāmatva etc.

The Pūrvapaksin says that when once the Gunin, the Daharākāśa is meditated upon, there is no need to meditate upon the Daharākāśa again while meditating upon the Gunas

The Siddhānta is that the Daharākāśa particularised by specific qualities is different from the Daharākāśa in its natural form, so, the repetition of the meditation on the Daharākāśa is necessary, just as separate offerings are made to Indra, the Rājan, to Indra, the Adhirāja, to Indra, the Svarāj, although Indra is the same

[According to Sankara the subject for discussion is whether Prāna the best (or, absorber) of the sense-organs Vāk etc , and Vāyu, the best (or, absorber) of the Deities Agni etc , (described in the *Brha* and the *Chāndogya*) are separate or the same

The Siddhānta is they are separate —

आध्यानार्थो ह्ययमध्यात्माधिदैवविभागोपदेश, सोऽसत्याध्यानपृथक्त्वेऽनर्थक स्यात्। तत्त्वाभेदेऽप्यवस्थाभेदादुपदेशभेदवशेनानुचिन्तनभेदोपपत्ते । तदुक्त सकर्षे 'नाना वा देवता पृथग्ज्ञानात' इति। विधैक्येऽपि त्वध्यात्माधिदैवभेदात्प्रवृत्तिभेदो भवति, अग्निहोत्र इव सायप्रात कालभेदात्।]

[455] (Sūtra 43) The nineteenth Adhikarana contains only one Sūtra Sūtras 44-50 and 51-52 form the twentieth and twentifirst Adhikaranas Sankara takes Sūtras 44-52 as forming only one Adhikarana.

In the *Taittiriya*, after the Dahara-vidyā comes the Nārāyana-anuvāka describing the Aksara as thousand-headed etc

The Pūrvapaksin says that the context shows that the Nārāyana-anuvāka is just a continuation of the preceding Dahara-anuvāka, so the same Dahara-vidyā is mentioned here

The Siddhānta is — Various characteristic features of the Paramātman are found here, such as Asthūlatva, Ānandagunatva etc Linga (चिन्हभूत वाक्यम्) is always more powerful than the Prakarana, as Jaimini has declared Expressions like Padmakośapratikāśa reminding one of the Hārdākāśa cannot point out to the Dahara-vidyā in the face of the Linga

सहस्रशीर्षम्—Here the accusative must be treated as the nominative, in accordance with the expression तदुपासितव्यम् where the termination तव्य shows what the Upāsya is

[Sankara takes आत्मनोऽग्नीनर्कनिमनोमयान्मनश्चित वाग्चित . कर्मचितोऽग्निचित (where the imaginary or superimposed fires are mentioned) as the विषयवाक्य, and the question is whether these मनश्चितादि fires are subordinate to the sacrificial Kriyā or are केवलविद्यात्मक The Siddhānta is that though the context favours the view that they are क्रियानुप्रवेशिन, the Lingas show that they constitute an independent Vidyā]

[456] (Sūtra 44) The *Śatapatha-Brāhmana* mentions the fires, मनश्चित, वाक्चित, प्राणचित चक्षुश्चित, श्रोत्रचित कर्मचित, and अग्निचित

The question is whether these fires are विद्यात्म or क्रियात्म

The Pūrvapakṣin says that they are क्रियारूप as the context shows that the इष्टकाचित fire is the subject-matter Even if the fires are विद्यारूप, there क्रियारूपत्व is appropriate like the मानसग्रह (the Soma cup imagined in the mind)

In a twelve-day or दशरात्र sacrifice the tenth day is called अ-विवाक्य (when no वाक्य is to be uttered) the sacrificial acts like the taking up of the Soma-cup etc , are to be gone through in the mind

Sankara remarks — लिङ्गमपि स्वेतनातायक न प्रकरणाद्बलीयो भवति। अन्यार्थदर्शन ह्येतत्' सापादिकाग्निप्रशमाहुत्यलात्। मानसवत्। यथा-दशरात्रस्य दशमेऽहनि अविवाक्ये पृथिव्या पात्रेण, समुद्रस्य सोमस्य, प्रजापतये देवतायै गृह्यमाणस्य ग्रहणासादनहवनाहरणोपह्वानभक्षणानि मानसान्येवाम्नायन्ते। स च मानसोऽपि ग्रहकल्प क्रियाप्रकरणात् क्रियाशेप एव भवति, एवमयमप्यग्निकल्प इत्यर्थ ।

(Sūtra 45) The Pūrvapakṣin continues — Further, the passage एकैक एव तावान्यावानसौ पूर्व shows that the strength of the इष्टकाचित fire gets into each of the imagined fires as well so the imagined fires are क्रियामय

[457] (Sūtra 46) The Siddhānta is—The fires मनश्चित etc , are विद्यारूप alone, as is clear from the expression एव in विद्यया हैवैत एवंविदश्चिता भवन्ति, and the क्रतु is also विद्यामय as is seen from the passage ते मनसैवाधायन्त मनसैवाचीयन्त

Sankara reads दर्शनाच्च as a separate Sūtra By दर्शन is meant the Sūtra लिङ्गभूयस्त्वात् (III 3 44).

[458] (Sūtra 47) Sruti, Linga and Vākya are more powerful than Prakarana All these favour the विद्यारूपत्व of the imagined fires, and so the independent state of the fires मनश्चित etc , stands unchallenged

[459] (Sūtra 48) Though there is no actual injunction, nor is seen any connection with the fruit, still the विद्यामय sacrifice as being separate from the क्रियामय sacrifice, is pointed out by the accessories mentioned such as मनसैव ग्रहा अगृह्यन्त By आदि we are to understand Sruti, Linga and Vākya From the Anubandhas are known other Vidyās as being separate from the Dahara-vidyā The injunction though not expressly stated can always be understood to be there, as also the Fruit.

Sankara says — एवमनुबन्धादिभ्य कारणेभ्य स्वातन्त्र्य मनश्चितादीनाम्। प्रज्ञान्तरपृथक्त्ववत्। यथा प्रज्ञान्तराणि शाण्डिल्यविद्याप्रभृतीनि स्वेन स्वेनानुबध्यमानानि पृथगेव कर्मभ्य प्रज्ञान्तरेभ्यश्च स्वतन्त्राणि भवन्ति, एवमिति। दृष्टश्चावेष्टे राजसूयप्रकरणपठिताया प्रकरणादुत्कर्षो वर्णत्रयानुबन्धात्, राजयज्ञाच्च राजसूयस्य। तदुक्त प्रथमे काण्डे—' क्रत्वर्थायामिति चेन वर्णत्रयसंयोगात् ' (जै सू ११।४।७)

[460] (Sutra 49) The objector says that the मनश्चित fires are quite similar to the actual fires they have the same potency as that of the fires, so they should have क्रियामयक्रत्वनुप्रवेश

The answer is—Being similar does not mean that an entity should be possessed of every characteristic of the entity compared to some characteristic or other possessed by both is sufficient for the function of Atideśa For instance, in the *Satapatha* the मण्डलपुरुष is said to be Mṛtyu this means only that the मण्डलपुरुष is the controller like Mṛtyu not that he abides in or goes to the Mṛtyuloka The Atidesa also shows that the मनश्चित fires have their fruit through विद्यामयक्रतु, as the इष्टकाचित fire has from the particular sacrifice.

Śankara says—न मानसग्रहसामान्यादपि मनश्चितादीनां क्रियाशेषत्वं कल्प्यम्।...न हि किंचित् कस्यचित्केनचित्सामान्यं न संभवति...मृत्युवत्।...अग्निर्वै मृत्युः, इति चाग्न्यादित्यपुरुषयोः समानेऽपि मृत्युशब्दप्रयोगे नात्यन्तसाम्यापत्तिः। यथा च 'असौ वाव लोको गौतमाग्निः...' इत्यत्र न समिदादिसामान्याल्लोकस्याग्निभावापत्तिः।

(Sūtra 50) The next *Brāhmaṇa* passage अयं वाव लोक एषोऽग्निश्चितः...shows that the मनश्चित passage also points out to विद्यामयत्व. The Vaiśvānara-vidyā also enjoins Vidyā. Therefore, the *Agnirahasya*-passage cannot be referring to क्रियैकविषय. मनश्चित etc., are to be associated with the *Bṛha*—passage, as there are so many parts of the fire that are to be imagined in respect of the fires मनश्चित etc.

Śaṅkara says—भूय न्यवयवाः संपादयितव्या विद्यायामित्येतस्मात्कारणादग्निनानुबध्यते विद्या, न कर्माङ्गत्वात्।

[461] (Sūtra 51) The twenty-first Adhikaraṇa comprises two Sūtras.

Some say that the Pratyagātman should be thought of as being the knower, doer etc., because as such he abides in the body of the worshipper. The passage यथाक्रतु ... refers to the Upāsya.

[462] (Sūtra 52) The above view is refuted here. The Pratyagātman with the form as knower, is not to be meditated upon, but the Paramātman possessed of the attributes Apahatapāpmatva etc., who is different from the Ātman in the Saṁsāra-state and is to be reached by the Released. Just as the attainment to Brahman in its real nature is mentioned; so also is mentioned the realisation of Atman as he really is, which takes place after a lapse of time.

Saṅkara takes the above two Sūtras as referring to the views of the Lokāyatikas, and their refutation (Bhāskara also understands the Lokāyatikas by एके). Śaṅkara says — समाप्ता प्रासङ्गिकी कथा when he begins his comment on the next Adhikaraṇa. The reference to the doctrine of the Lokāyatikas is clearly out of place here; for the whole of the third Adhyāya dealing with the Vidyās and the 'Upāsanās, presupposes the existence of the Ātman as apart from the body. Could it be that these two Sūtras are an interpolation? The interpretation by other Bhāṣyakāras is not satisfactory either.

Saṅkara — इह देहव्यतिरिक्तस्यात्मनः सद्भावः समर्थ्यते बन्धमोक्षाधिकारसिद्धये। ... प्रथमे पादे शास्त्रफलोपभोगयोग्यस्य देहव्यतिरिक्तस्यात्मनोऽस्तित्वमुक्तम्। सत्यमुक्तं भाष्यकृता न तु तत्रात्मास्तित्वे सूत्रमस्ति। इह तु स्वयमेव सूत्रकृता तदस्तित्वमाक्षेपपुरःसरं प्रतिष्ठापितम् ... आक्षेपपरिपूर्विका हि परिहारोक्तिर्विवक्षितेऽर्थे स्थूणानिखननन्यायेन दृढां बुद्धिमुत्पादयति।

Nimbārka—उपासनवेलायां बद्धावस्थः प्रत्यगात्मा चिन्तनीयः, शरीरे तादृशस्यैवात्मनः सत्त्वादित्येके।

Vallabha—एके, तैत्तिरीया।

Vijñānabhikṣu—अनुबन्ध इत्यनुवर्तते। एके तु, अन्ये तु, एवमाहुः (मोक्षभाजामनर्थं गतिरपोऽनुबन्धो भवति) आत्मनः शरीरे भावात्, सत्त्वात्।

Saṅkara reads the Sūtra as व्यतिरेकस्तद्भावाभावित्वात्..., Bhāskara, Nimbārka, Śrikaṇṭha etc; read...तद्भावभावित्वात्.

उपलब्धिवत्—उपलब्धिस्वरूप एव च न आत्मेत्यात्मनो देहव्यतिरिक्तत्वम् (Sankara)
—यथोपलब्ध्यादन्योपलब्धि । (Bhāskara)
—ध्यानानुरूपपरमात्मप्राप्तिवत् । (Nimbārka)
—यथा नद्यः स्यन्दमानाः, इत्यत्र नदीसमुद्रोपलब्धिवत्, जीवनयाणोरेकलोपदेशो विधीयते । (Srīkantha)
—घटाकाशयोरिव एव । न तूपलब्धिवत् यथा, आत्मना सह, उपलब्धिनियमेनोपलब्धेरात्मा-व्यतिरेकोऽन्योन्यवत्, नैव शरीरस्य । (Vijñānabhiksu)

[463] (Sūtra 53) The *twenty-second Adhikarana comprises two* Sūtras.

In connection with the Udgīthopāsanā, the Upāsanās concerned with the parts of the sacrifice, such as Om, Pañcavidha Sāman (Hinkara, Prastāva, Udgitha, Pratihāra and Nidhana), Uktha, this Loka, are mentioned

The Pūrvapaksin says that these Upāsanās connected with the Udgitha are to be associated only with the particular recensions.

The answer is—The Upāsanās are to be associated with all the Sakhās of the Vedas, as the sacrifice is the same everywhere

(Sūtra 54) The *Mantras* are made use of in all Sākhās By आदि, we are to understand Jāti, Guna, Samkhyā Sādrśya, Krama, Dravya and Karman (all these are to be considered in all Sākhās).

Sankara says — मन्त्राणां कर्मणां गुणानां च शाखान्तरोत्पन्नानामपि शाखान्तर उपसंग्रहो दृश्यते तस्माद्यथाश्रयाणां कर्माङ्गानां सर्वत्रानुवृत्तिरेवमाश्रितानामपि प्रत्ययानामित्यविरोध ।

[464] (Sūtra 55) The twenty-third Adhikarana comprises only one Sūtra

In the Vaiśvānara-vidyā, Vaiśvānara is the Paramātman having the three words as his body, with the various limbs equated with Dyau, Āditya etc

The question is whether the Upāsanā is to be of Vaiśvānara as a whole, or of the various parts.

The Pūrvapaksin says—There should be व्यस्तोपासना, as there is a separate Upadeśa and also Phalabheda

[465] An objector points out that in that case the समस्तोपासना would not be in order as a separate fruit is mentioned, there is no Vākyabheda in this arrangement, as the case is similar to the instruction about नामाद्युपासन and its fruit in the Bhūmavidyā where also a separate fruit is mentioned for भूमविद्या

The answer is — समस्तोपासन is more appropriate, because thereby alone is एकवाक्यता secured, the उपासन and the फल about the अवयवोपासन are just अनुवाद For instance, Vaiśvānara is offered द्वादशकपाल (offering on twelve potsherds), though अष्टकपाल etc., are mentioned in connection with the sacrifice, which shows that there is to be समस्तोपासन. In the नामाद्युपासन in the Bhūmavidyā, no disaster is mentioned, as accruing from the wrong Upāsanā, while here in the व्यस्तोपासन of Vaiśvānara, the loss of the head, the loss of eye-sight etc, are mentioned, so the two cases are not on the same level

Śaṅkara says — भूम्नः पदार्थोपचयात्मकस्य समस्तस्य वैश्वानरोपासनस्य ज्यायस्त्वं प्राधान्यमस्मिन् वाक्ये विवक्षितं भवितुमर्हति, न प्रत्येकमवयवोपासनानामपि। क्रतुवत्। यथा क्रतुषु दर्शपूर्णमासप्रभृतिषु सामस्त्येन साङ्गप्रधानप्रयोग एवैको विवक्ष्यते, न व्यस्तानामपि प्रयोगः प्रयाजादीनाम्। नाप्येकदेशाङ्गयुक्तस्य प्रधानस्य तद्वत्।... केचित्त्वत्र समस्तोपासनं पक्षं ज्यायांसं प्रतिष्ठाप्य ज्यायस्त्ववचनादेव किल व्यस्तोपासनपक्षमपि सूत्रकारोऽनुमन्यत इति कथयन्ति, तदयुक्तम्। एकवाक्यतावगतौ सत्यां वाक्यभेदकल्पनस्यान्याय्यत्वात्।

[**466**] (Sūtra 56) The twenty-fourth Adhikaraṇa comprises only one Sūtra.

There are various Vidyās, Sadvidyā, Bhūmavidyā etc., described in the same Śākhā or different Śākhās having the same fruit Brahmaprāpti; there are others, with the fruit concerning Prāṇa etc.

The Pūrvapakṣin says that as the Brahman to be known is the same, there is रूपैक्य in the case of the Vidyās, and so विद्यैक्य is clearly indicated.

The Siddhānta is — The Vidyās are different as there is Bheda evident all through — Bheda in respect of Śabda Abhyāsa, Samkhyā, Guṇa, Prakriyā and Nāmadheya. So, there is विद्याभेद.

Śankara says — वैद्यैकत्वनिमित्ते च विद्यैकत्वे सर्वत्र निरङ्कुशे प्रतिज्ञायमाने समस्तगुणोपसंहारोऽशक्यः प्रतिज्ञायेत।

[**467**] (Sūtra 57) The twenty-fifth Adhikaraṇa comprises two Sūtras.

The question is whether the different Vidyās are to be optionally gone through, or they are compulsory.

The Siddhānta is — The fruit of all these viz. Brahmaprāpti being the same, there is no point in going through all of them; so, विकल्प is obviously indicated.

Śaṅkara takes this Sūtra as forming a separate Adhikaraṇa.

[**468**] (Sūtra 58) The Vidyās that cater for some specific object desired, may be combined according to one's will; for, the fruit is not अविशिष्ट there (अधिकस्याधिकं फलम्).

(Rāmānuja's comment on this Sūtra is half as short as the Sūtra itself !)

Śaṅkara takes this Sūtra as forming a separate Adhikaraṇa.

(Sūtra 59) The twenty-sixth Adhikaraṇa contains six Sūtras. With this Adhikaraṇa, the third Quarter of the third Adhyāya comes to an end.

Sūtras 59–62 form the Pūrvapakṣa.

The question discussed is whether the Udgītha-vidyās associated with the parts of the Udgīthakratu, are to be taken up as a rule in the Kratus being meant for the Kratu, or optionally.

The Pūrvapakṣin says that the Vidyās must be taken up as a rule. For, in the injunction उद्गीथमुपासीत, there is no mention of फलसंबन्ध (in the case of गोदोहनेन पशुकामस्य प्रणयेत्, फलसंबन्ध is established by the expression पशुकामः so, गोदोहन is optional; only he who is पशुकाम can use the गोदोहन). In all cases, the Upāsanā is connected with the Udgītha. There is फलनिर्देश in the passage यदेव विद्यया करोति ...तदेव वीर्यवत्तरम्, but it is merely a glorification (Arthavāda), as in the case of one using the ladle made of leaves, not hearing any calumny.

(Sūtra 60) There is no additional qualification in उद्गीथमुपासीत (like पशुकामस्य), so the Upāsanā is only उद्गीथाङ्ग.

(Sūtra 61) The passage होतृषदनाद्धैवापि दुरुद्गीथमनुसमाहरति proves the समाहार (combination) rule. Thus—होतृ-सदन is the seat of the Hotṛ priest, then, the work of the Hotṛ, which is to recite the Om. When the Om is properly recited by tha Hotṛ, even if the Udgātṛ priest commits a fault in singing the Udgītha (which is the same as Om), there is no flaw. Thus the two, Om and Udgītha, are to be considered together, and so, the Upāsanā becomes a part of the sacrifice.

(Sūtra 62) The Sruti ओमिति, आश्रावयति; ओमिति शंसति etc., shows that Om is associated with the Upāsanā; hence like the Udgītha etc., the Upāsanās—Udgīthadi-are to be gone through as a rule.

[469] (Sūtra 63) The Siddhānta is—The Udgītha-upāsanās are not associated with the Udgītha in the Sruti. Association is possible in such cases only when one thing is subordinate to another. Vidyā is said to make Karman more powerful; that means it ensures some fruit different from that of the sacrifice. Being more powerful, in effect, means giving the fruit without delay. In the case of the passage पर्णमयी जुहूः ..., the use of the ladle is not directly the means of the fruit — hearing no calumny; so, the फलश्रुति there is merely अर्थवाद्.

(Sūtra 64) The Sruti says that the realisation of Brahman affords protection to all. If उद्गीथाद्युपासनाs are to be gone through as a rule, the fruit would ensue from the Upāsanā itself, and the protection by Brahman would be meaningless.

So, the Upāsanās are not to be gone through as a rule, as they are intended to give some special fruit.

In III. 3 (third Quarter of the third Adhyāya) the important question is dealt with from a practical point of view viz. how to reconcile the different Vidyās described in the Upaniṣads, under different names, sometimes under the same name, but with different details.

Rāmānuja arrives at the following major conclusions in this connection :—

(1) There is विद्यैक्य, if the Codanā (injunction), Vedya (the entity to be known), Ākhyā (name) and Phalasaṁyoga (association with the fruit) are the same, as Codanā etc., enable one to conclude that the Vidyās are identical.

(2) Repetition, different context, different Vidheya do not necessarily lead to Vidyā-bheda. In the case of one and the same Vidyā, it is possible to have the above three features concerning the different types of students learning the Vidyā.

(3) Any specific qualification laid down for the students does not lead to Vidyā-bheda; for, that pertains only to the Veda or Svādhyāya of the students.

(4) All the Upāsanās are meant for the realisation of the Paramātman, according to the Sruti This means that the various attributes (Gunas) mentioned in respect of the Paramātman, are to be ordinarily combined for the purpose of the Upāsanā

(5) Some times, though the Nāmadheya and Codanā in the Vidyā are the same Prakarana-bheda and Rūpa-bheda lead to Vidyā-bheda

(6) We must distinguish between the natural or essential attributes, and the superimposed attributes of Brahman; only, the former are to be combined or taken note of elsewhere The superimposed attributes have their own use for the purpose of the Upāsanā.

(7) Only those superimposed Gunas which are not mentioned elsewhere can be the subject of a Vidhi or injunction

(8) Being connected with a particular place (Sthāna-sambandhitva) shows Rūpabheda which is responsible for Vidyā-bheda.

(9) Certain Gunas like Dyuvyāpti cannot be associated with any limited or Alpa-Sthāna described in a particular Vidyā, and so, there cannot be Upasamhāra of them.

(10) When Rūpa, Phala and Samyoga (with the Phala) are known to be different, the Gunas described in one Sākhā cannot be associated with the same Vidyā in another Sākhā

Rāmānuja, on the whole, has ably applied the above principles to the particular cases discussed

---

This Quarter is usually neglected by the students, it is therefore thought necessary to give here a brief summary of the questions raised and discussed here

Vaiśvānara-vidyā

(1) This Vidyā is described in the various recensions with some variations, all the same it is one Vidyā because—

(Jaimini Sūtra (एकं वा सयोग रूप-चोदना-आख्या-विशेषात् II 4 9) is our guide in such cases)

(A) Codanā or Vidhi is the same

(B) Rūpa (Vaiśvānara) also is the same.

(C) Ākhyā (or, name, Vaisvānara) is the same

(D) Phalasamyoga (Brahma-prāpti) is the same

(2) Vidheya-bheda, or different context, or repetition of the Sruti does not necessarily prove Vidyā-bheda, as the teaching has to take into account the capacity of the learners

(3) Certain peculiar features like the Siro-vrata are connected with the Veda-study and not with the Vidyā.

(4) When Vidyaikya is established, the attributes mentioned in other recensions are to be incorporated everywhere

Udgītha-vidyā.

(5) The Udgītha-vidyā described in the *Chāndogya* is different from that in the *Bṛha*, because

(A) the Prakaraṇa is different ;

(B) the Chandogas worship the Praṇava which is a part of the Udgītha, while the Vājins worship the whole of the Udgītha. Thus Prakaraṇabheda shows Vidheyā-bheda and Rūpa-bheda which lead to Vidyā-bheda.

(6) Mere Saṁjñaikya does not lead to विद्यैक्य.

Prāṇa-vidyā

(7) Additional Guṇas mentioned do not make the Vidyā different.

(8) What may be called Svarūpa(basic)-Guṇas of Brahman must be incorporated everywhere.

(9) Guṇas like Priyaśirastva based upon some superimposition upon Brahman, are valid only in the particular context, and are useful only for meditation-purposes.

(10) The word Ātman is often used to mean the Paramātman.

(11) The Śāstra enjoins only what is Apūrva; what can be understood from the Smṛti, Ācāra etc., can not be the subject of a Vidhi.

(12) A mere difference in the list of Guṇas does not produce Rūpa-bheda.

(13) Even if the Upāsya is one, Upāsya-rūpa-viśesa does make the Vidyās different ; e g. Brahman worshipped as abiding in the Sun's orb, and as having the eye as the Adhāra.

(14) The possibility of incorporating various attributes has got to be carefully considered ; e. g. संभृतिद्युव्याप्ति etc., can not be incorporated in the Vidyās concerned with limited Sthānas ; such attributes serve the purpose of glorifying the Vidyā in question, that is all.

Puruṣa-Vidyā

(15) The Puruṣa-vidyās in the *Taittirīya* and the *Chāndogya* are different, because there is Rūpa-bheda and Phala-bheda; so, the attributes in one recension cannot be incorporated elsewhere.

(16) The *Mantras* recited at the beginning of the Upaniṣads, and the Karmans associated with them are not Vidyāngas; they are associated with the Abhicāra-karman, or study.

(17) The question about the abandonment and acceptance of the Sukṛta and Duṣkṛta of the Vidvat is solved as meaning that Hāna must be regarded as incomplete without the Upādāna being indicated and *vice versa.*

The Sukṛta and Duṣkṛta are completely given up when the Vidvat abandons the body.

It is unnecessary to hold that some part of the Karman remains to account for the subtle body accompanying the Soul after death. The Vidyā-māhātmya ensures this.

In the case of Vasiṣṭha and others, their Prārabdha-karman caused their association with another body.

(18) All those going in for some Upāsanā or other have to go by the Arcirādi path.

(19) In the case of all Brahmavidyās, the attributes Asthūlatva etc., associated with the Akṣara-Brahman, have to be understood.

(20) प्रश्नप्रतिवचनभेद does not lead to विद्याभेद, so long as the injunction is the same and the entity referred to is the same.

(21) In the *Chāndogya*, Ākāśa is the Upāsya; in the *Bṛha* the entity abiding in the Ākāśa is the Upāsya; but this does not lead to Vidyā-bheda, as the Vidyā is easily understood as being the same, because the Guṇas, and the Phala (Brahma-prāpti) are the same, and the word Akāśa itself means Paramātman. The various Guṇas indicate respect and सत्यकामत्व etc., are definitely associated with the Mukta.

(22) Udgīthopāsanas are to be invariably associated with Karmans.

Dahara - vidyā

(23) Different Gunas mentioned are to be associated with the Dahara and are to be meditated upon as directed.

(24) Where special qualities of the Para Brahman are definitely mentioned, परब्रह्मन् must be taken to be the Upāsya (e. g. though the context refers to the Dahara-vidyā, the Nārāyaṇa-section deals with the Highest Brahman, the Nārāyaṇa); these characteristics (Liṅgas) are more powerful than the context, as laid down by Jaimini.

Manaścita fires etc.

(25) The fires Manaścita etc., are not क्रियारूप, but विद्यारूप, and so the sacrifice described is विद्यामय. Śruti, Liṅga and Vākya are always more important than Prakarana. An Atideśa cannot be accepted merely on the strength of any common characteristic. So, the Agnirahasya-passage cannot indicate क्रियैकविषयत्व.

(26) Ātman is to be meditated upon in the form in which he is found in the state of Mokṣa.

(27) Like the Mantras, the Upāsanas also associated with the Udgītha etc., are to be regarded as belonging to all recensions or Śākhās.

Vaisvānara-vidyā

(28) The Vaiśvānara (Paramātman) described as having the three worlds as his body, has to be worshipped as a whole and not in parts. It is only then that एकवाक्यता is duly ensured.

(29) The various Vidyās with their special characteristics must be treated as being separate; even though all of them point out to the same Phala, Brahmaprāpti.

(30) The different Vidyās cannot be joined together, and there is no point in doing so, as the Phala is the same. Where the Phala is specifically shown to be different, the Vidyās cannot be considered together, because there cannot be between them the relation of part and the whole or अङ्गाङ्गिभाव.

We give below Saṅkara's findings on the topics described in the third Quarter of the third Adhyāya, which would be found interesting by the reader.

(1) सर्ववेदान्तप्रत्ययानि विज्ञानानि ।

(2) न चावापोद्वापभेदात्, वेद्यभेदो विद्याभेदश्चाशङ्क्यः ।

(3) अन्यत्रोदितानां विज्ञानगुणानामन्यत्रापि समाने विज्ञान उपसंहारो भवति, अर्थाभेदात् ।

(4) प्रकरणभेदात्, विद्याभेदः ।

(5) संज्ञैकत्वात्, विद्यैकत्वं नोपपद्यते ।

(6) शब्दयोः सामानाधिकरण्ये श्रूयमाणे, अध्यासापवादैकत्वविशेषणपक्षाणां मध्ये विशेषणपक्ष एव निरवद्यः ।

(7) एकप्रधानसंबद्धा धर्मा एकत्राप्युच्यमानाः सर्वत्रैवोपसंहर्तव्याः ।

(8) न प्रियशिरस्त्वादयो ब्रह्मधर्माः, कोशधर्मास्त्वेते...परस्मिन्ब्रह्मणि चित्तावतारोपायमात्रत्वेनैते परिकल्प्यन्ते, न द्रष्टव्यत्वेन ।

(9) न ह्यतरेषु परत्वेन प्रतिपन्नेषु किंचित्प्रयोजनं दृश्यते श्रूयते वा । पुरुषे त्विन्द्रियादिभ्यः परस्मिन्सर्वानर्थव्रातातीते प्रतिपन्ने दृश्यते प्रयोजनं मोक्षसिद्धिः ।

(10) श्रुत्यन्तरप्रसिद्धो हि समानविषयो विशेषः श्रुत्यन्तरेऽप्युपसंहर्तव्यो भवति ।

(11) प्रतिपादनप्रकारभेदेऽपि प्रतिपाद्यार्थाभेदः ।

(12) न च भिन्नविषययोः श्रुतिस्मृत्योर्मूलमूलिभावोऽवकल्पते ।

(13) सर्वं तु प्राणस्यान्नमितीयमन्नदृष्टिश्चोद्यते, तत्साहचर्याच्चापो वास इत्यत्रापि नापामाचमनं चोद्यते, प्रसिद्धास्त्वेव त्वाचमनीयास्वप्सु परिधानदृष्टिश्चोद्यत इति युक्तम् । न ह्यर्धवैशसं संभवति ।

(14) यथा भिन्नासु शाखासु विद्यैकत्वं गुणोपसंहारश्च भवति, एवमेकस्यामपि शाखायां भवितुमर्हति... नापि विद्याभेदे *गुणव्यवस्थापनम्।*

(15) एकस्यापि त्ववस्थाविशेषोपादानेनैवोपनिषद्विशेषोपदेशात्तदवस्थस्यैव सा भवितुमर्हति ।

(16) एकमपि हि ब्रह्म विभूतिभेदैरनेकधोपास्यत इति स्थितिः ।

(17) यदपि किंचिन्मरणावभृथत्वादिसाम्यं तदपि, अल्पीयस्त्वाद्भूयसा वैलक्षण्येनाभिभूयमानं न प्रत्यभिज्ञापनक्षमम् । ...सत्यां च गतौ मुख्य एवार्थ आश्रयितव्यो न भाक्तः । ... तस्मात्, शाखान्तराधीतानां पुरुषविद्याधर्माणामाशीर्मन्त्रादीनामप्राप्तिस्तैत्तिरीयके ।

(18) अर्थान्तरेषु विनियुक्तानां रहस्यपठितानामपि सतां न संनिधिमात्रेण विद्याशेषत्वोपपत्तिः । दुर्बलो हि संनिधिः श्रुत्यादिभ्यः ।

(19) हानौ त्वेतस्यां केवलायामपि श्रूयमाणायामुपादानं संनिपतितुमर्हति । तच्छेषत्वात् । हानशब्दशेषो ह्युपादानशब्दः समधिगतः कौषीतकिरहस्ये ।

(20) गतिकारणभूतो ह्यर्थः पर्यङ्कविद्यादिषु सगुणेषूपासनेषूपलभ्यते । ... न हि सम्यग्दर्शने तल्लक्षणार्थोपलब्धिरस्ति ।

(21) तस्मादैकान्तिकी विदुषः कैवल्यसिद्धिः ।

(22) न च परमात्मविद्यायां भेदाभेदविचारावतारोऽस्तीत्युक्तम् । तस्मात् प्रपञ्चार्थ एवैष योगः ।

(23) वेद्यैकत्वाद्विद्यैकत्वम् ।

(24) प्रक्रमभेदाद्विद्याभेदे सति गुणव्यवस्थैव युक्ता ।

(25) गुणवतस्तु ब्रह्मण एकत्वाद्विभूतिप्रदर्शनायायं गुणोपसंहारः सूत्रितो नोपासनाय ।

(26) *विद्यैक्येऽपि त्वध्यात्माधिदैवभेदात्प्रवृत्तिभेदो भवति, अग्निहोत्र इव सायंप्रात कालभेदात् ।*

(27) यत्र हि विस्पष्टो विधायको लिङ्गादिरुपलभ्यते, युक्तं तत्र संकीर्तनमात्रस्यार्थवादत्वम् ।

(28) न हि किंचित्कस्यचित्केनचित्सामान्यं न संभवति, न च तावता यथास्वं वैषम्यं निवर्तते ।

(29) न ह्यग्निरुष्णः सन् स्वात्मानं दहति । न हि नटः शिक्षितः सन् स्वस्कन्धमधिरोक्ष्यति ।

(30) वेद्यैकत्वनिमित्ते च विद्यैकत्वे सर्वत्र निरङ्कुशे प्रतिज्ञायमाने समस्तगुणोपसंहारोऽशक्यः प्रतिज्ञायेत तस्मात्, सुष्ठूच्यते नानाशब्दादिभेदादिति ।

This Quarter deals with the role played by Vidya and Karman in securing Moksa.

The first Adhikarana contains as many as twenty Sūtras, and is the longest of all Adhikaranas Sūtras 1, 8-20 are the Siddhanta-sūtras while 2-7 represent the Pūrvapaksa

[470] (Sūtra 1) अत —विद्यात (विद्या was the matter in hand in the last Quarter)

Bādarayana holds that Moksa can come only from Vidyā or Jñana, as is expressly stated in the Surti

[471] (Sūtra 2) Jaimini holds that after all Vidya enables the sacrificer to perform his duty properly, and hence it is subordinate to the sacrifice Just as the materials for the sacrifice are but the auxiliaries of the sacrifice Vidya is also on the same footing So विद्यात पुरुषार्थ is only an Arthavāda not to be understood literally

[472] (Sutras 3-5) Jaimini s view is fortified by the following arguments —

(1) Brahman-knowers like Janaka, Aśvapati Kekaya and others are known to have performed sacrifices

(2) The Sruti says whatever is performed by Vidyā (विद्यया — the instrumental case shows that Vidyā is Karmāṅga) is more potent The passage यदेव विद्यया करोति occurs in the context dealing with Udgithavidyā but as Sruti is always more powerful than the context, the passage must be understood as referring to Vidyās in general

(3) Both Vidyā and Karman are associated with the Jīva, as is clear from the passage त (जीव) विद्याकर्मणी समन्वारभते ।

[473] (Sūtras 6-7) Karman is prescribed by the Sruti (वेदमधीत्य) for those possessed of Vidyā

तद्वत —विद्यावत

(5) कुर्वन्नेवेह कर्माणि , it is clear from this passage that एव excludes Jñana, and Karman alone is capable of giving its fruit independently

[474] (Sūtra 8) The Siddhānta is that Bādarāyana s view is the correct one The Sruti describes the Highest Brahman alone as the Vedya (fit to be known), being far superior to the Jiva who is the Kartr

[475] (Sūtra 9) If the Sruti describes Janaka and others as engaged in Karman, it also refers to Kāvaseyas and other Rsis as deliberately giving up all Karman as the fruit of Karman is opposed to Moksa the fruit of Vidyā

[476] (Sūtra 10) The passage यदेव विद्यया करोति is misunderstood by the Pūrvapaksin it refers only to the Udgitha-vidyā the matter in hand If the Sruti had said यदेव करोति तद्विद्यया, the passage would have been meant for general application

[477] (Sūtra 11) The passage विद्याकर्मणी समन्वारभेते simply means that Vidyā and Karman give their fruit independently. When one says—' Let these hundred rupees be divided between A and B ', fifty rupees are given to each one of them. There is no question of any joint or co-operative ownership.

[478] (Sūtra 12) The passage वेदमधीत्य confines itself to the Adhyayana, and has nothing to do with any subsequent act.

आधानवत्—The Sruti अग्नीनादधीत enjoins only the laying on of the fires, not the subsequent adjustment of the fires as required by the sacrificial procedure.

[479] (Sūtra 13) The passage कुर्वन्नेवेह...does not refer to any Karman having a separate fruit as such ; the Karman can very well be subordinate to Vidyā.

(Sūtra 14) Or, the passage is meant only to glorify Vidyā.

[480] (Sūtra 15) The Śruti ... किं प्रजया करिष्यामः clearly says that the householder's stage of life could be abandoned or skipped over by the Vidvat. This shows that Vidyā cannot be Karmāṅga.

(Sūtra 16) The Śruti भिद्यते हृदयग्रन्थिः ... proclaims that all Karman is completely annihilated when the Highest is realised. So, Vidyā can never be Karmāṅga.

[481] Sūtras 17-20 describe the exact position of the Saṁnyāsins (Urdhvaretas — One who does not indulge in sexual intercourse).

(Sūtra 17) The question is — Can the Saṁnyāsāśrama be accepted as a recognised stage of life at all ?

The objector says — The passage यावज्जीवमग्निहोत्रं जुहोति shows that the Agnihotra has to be performed throughout one's life; the Saṁnyāsins do not perform the Agnihotra. So, it is better to say that the Saṁnyāsāśrama is not recognised as authoritative.

The Siddhānta is — The Sruti which is always more powerful than the Smṛti, actually says त्रयो धर्मस्कन्धाः (three pillars of Dharma) and refers to Pravrājins by name in this connection. Obviously, therefore, यावज्जीव ... refers *to those who continue to take interest in the Saṁsāra.*

[482] (Sūtra 18) Jaimini points out that the passage त्रयो धर्मस्कन्धाः does not contain any injunction ; there is only Anuvāda here, or the passage is *meant to be only a glorification of* the Brahmopāsana which is the subject-matter. As regards the passage ये के चारण्ये ..., it is really concerned with describing the Devayāna path, and there cannot be any question about any injunction about the Āśramas. The Śruti वीरहा वा एष देवानां ... actually condemns the Agni-worship in so many words. In short, the Śāstra does not countenance the Saṁnyāsāśrama.

[483] (Sūtra 19) Bādarāyaṇa points out that in the expression त्रयो धर्मस्कन्धाः, the important word is त्रयः (three); and the three pillars of Dharma must refer to, if we look carefully to the context, the three Āśramas—

(1) Brahmacārin (Adhyayana and Brahmacarya), (2) Gṛhastha (यज्ञोऽध्ययनं दानम्), and (3) Vaikhānasa and Saṁnyāsa (तपः). The *Viṣṇupurāṇa* puts this beyond all doubt. The Saṁnyāsāśrama is, therefore, surely on the same level as the Gṛhasthāśrama and is अनुष्ठेय.

The passage ये चेमे अरण्ये ... may contain the Devayāna-vidhi, but that Vidhi surely presupposes the Saṁnyāsāśrama as pointed out by the word Tapas which is a special characteristic of that Āśrama.

[484] (Sūtra 20) The Sūtrakāra gives his opinion that it would be better to say that the passages त्रयो धर्मस्कन्धाः etc., contain the injunction (Vidhi) itself, like the Dhāraṇa, in accordance with the Jaimini-sūtra विधिस्तु धारणेऽपूर्वत्वात् ।

[शेषलक्षण — लक्षण means Adhyāya].

In the Mahāpitṛ sacrifice, and the Pretāgnihotra, the oblation placed in the ladle is to be taken to the Āhavanīya fire, with the Samidh held under the oblation; though the next passage उपरि हि देवेभ्यो धारयति does not contain any Vidhi, still as holding the Samidh above the oblation in a sacrifice to the gods, is an Apūrva thing, we must understand that a Vidhi is intended here in accordance with the dictum अप्राप्ते विधिः.

ऋणश्रुतिः — One is born with the burden of three debts (पितृ-ऋण this is discharged when one gets a son; देव-ऋण, this is discharged by performing sacrifices etc., in accordance with the Śāstric injunctions; ऋषि-ऋण, this is discharged when the study of the Vedic lore is carried out properly.— It is needless to say that one who dies without discharging these debts deserves to be condemned); यावज्जीवनमग्निहोत्रं जुहुयात् is the जीवश्रुति, वीरहा वा is the अपवादश्रुति. All these passages can refer only to those who, not being totally Virakta, continue to take interest in worldly affairs.

[485] The second Adhikaraṇa contains two Sūtras.

(Sūtra 21) — उद्गीथ is the Omkāra; परार्घ्य most praiseworthy (पर means Brahman, अर्घ्य; fit to occupy the Ardha or place).

अष्टमः — The Omkāra is the eighth thus—

(1) पृथिवी — the Rasa of the Bhūtas — because पृथिवी supports the Bhūtas.

(2) अप् — the Rasa of Pṛthivī — waters are the Prakṛti of Pṛthivī.

(3) ओषधि — the Rasa of Ap — the Oṣadhis get their sustenance from the waters.

(4) पुरुष — the Rasa of Oṣadhis — Puruṣa lives on Oṣadhis.

(5) वाक् — the Rasa of Puruṣa — Vāk helps Puruṣa to be successful in life.

(6) ऋक् — the Rasa of Vāk — Ṛk is the most important manifestation of Vāk.

(7) सामन् — the Rasa of Ṛk — Cf. वेदानां सामवेदोऽस्मि (*Gītā* X. 22).

(8) उद्गीथ — The Rasa of Sāman — Udgītha is most appreciated in Sāman.

The question discussed is whether the passage स एष रसानां रसतम is intended only to glorify Udgitha and others, or Udgitha and others are looked upon as Rasa.

The Pūrvapaksin says that Udgītha and others are just glorified here, for, it is taken for granted that they are क्रत्वङ्ग (इयमेव जुहू स्वर्गो लोक आहवनीय is only स्तुतिपर as it is already propounded that Juhū is पृथिवी, and Svargaloka is the आहवनीय fire)

(Sūtra 22) The Siddhānta is — No mere स्तुतिपरत्व is intended here, रसतमादिदृष्टि is to be super imposed upon Udgitha and others because that is the Apūrva thing referred to here, which cannot be grasped by any means of proof. There is no other Vidhi near about, which would have made the passage somehow स्तुतिपर Further, it is obvious that expressions like उपासीत show that उपासनाविधि is intended here

[486] (Sūtra 23) The third Adhikarana contains two Sūtras

The question discussed is as follows —

There are certain Ākhyānas (narratives, episodes) described in the Sruti like the Pratardana and Śvetaketu Ākhyānas Are these Ākhyānas intended for being used independently for the Pariplava (revolving cycle of narratives) in the Aśvamedha or, do they give instruction about a particular Vidyā and so are विद्याविध्यर्थ?

[Pāriplava or the revolving cycle of legends or narratives, is a very important feature of the Aśvamedha. During the period of one year,— from the time when the horse, the victim-designate in the Aśvamedha, is let loose to wander at will, guarded by valiant warriors who frustrate all attempts to capture it, and returns victoriously — there are to be held thirty-six sessions, each one lasting for ten days, when discussions on cultural matters are held (in the sacrificial pandal) and different Ākhyānas are narrated with a different President presiding on each day, representing the various constituent elements of the society, for the purpose of bringing about 'emotional integration' in the Society at large

The ten Presidents (or kings) for the ten days of one sessions, in succession are — Manu, Yama, Varuna, Soma Arbuda Kādraveya, Kubera, Asita Dhānva, Matsya and Tārksya, and Dharma [See the Article 'The Pariplava — Revolving cycle of legends' by R D Karmarkar, published in the *Annals* B O R. I Vol *XXXII* Pp 26–40)]

The Siddhānta is that the Ākhyānas are intended to praise or glorify the Brahma-vidyā Not all Ākhyānas are used in the Pāriplava those that are specifically mentioned may have their use in the Pariplava only

(Sūtra 24) All the same, they are connected with some Vidyā-vidhi, as in आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्य यथा सोऽरोदीत् This passage is not to be understood independently, it is connected with the passage mentioning Hiranya (gold) as the Daksinā So, it is clear that 'the weeping of Agni' is associated with the Karmavidhi which prescribes gold as Daksinā (silver is not to be used for Daksinā, as it was produced out of tears that Agni shed!)

[487] The fourth Adhikarana contains only one Sūtra.

(Sūtra 23) The Samnyāsins are already possessed of Vidyā, and so they are not in need of any assistance from the performance of sacrifices etc.

[488] Only one Sūtra in the fifth Adhikaraṇa.

The Pūrvapakṣin says that the Sruti uses the expression यज्ञेन विविदिषन्ति (not यज्ञेन विन्दन्ति) which means that sacrifices are the means for creating the desire for Jñāna; they are not ज्ञानसाधन.

The Siddhānta is — इच्छा surely refers to something wished for, and Jñāna is what is to be ultimately secured by means of sacrifices etc.

अश्ववत — The horse is the means used for movement, but the horse does require the saddle, the bridle etc., to be put in proper order before the movement takes place; similarly Vidyā does require the help of sacrificial acts, before it achieves its object viz. salvation.

Interpretations by other Bhāṣyakāras are :—

अश्ववत् — 'अश्ववत्' इति योग्यतानिदर्शनम्। यथा च योग्यतावशेनाश्वो न लाङ्गलाकर्षणे नियुज्यते (this is not the case in Western countries, where the horse is invariably used for ploughing the fields) रथचर्यायां तु युज्यते। ... एवम् (शङ्कर).

यथा, अश्वस्य गमनक्रियापरंपरया ग्रामप्राप्तिहेतुत्वं तद्वत्। (श्रीकण्ठ)

यथा ... अश्वमेधोपासने संवत्सरे समारोपिताश्वोऽङ्गतयापेक्ष्यते, तथैव स्वशरीरब्रह्मप्रणवादौ समारोपितोऽग्न्युपवीतमन्त्रादियज्ञाद्यङ्गतयापेक्ष्यते। (विज्ञानभिक्षु).

[489] Only one Sūtra in the sixth Adhikaraṇa.

(Sūtra 27) The question discussed is whether Śama, Dama etc., are to be cultivated by the house-holder or not.

The Pūrvapaksin says — The house-holder's main interest is in the performance of sacrifices; this involves the activity of sense-organs prompted by the mind. Śama, Dama etc , would put an end to such activity. They might be helpful for a Samnyāsin, but not certainly for a house-holder.

The answer is — Śama, Dama etc., by producing concentration, ultimately *enable one to secure Vidyā. Sacrifices etc., also by destroying all sin,* are of great help in p omoting the concentration of mind, which is the means for securing salvation.

[490] The seventh Adhikarana comprises four Sūtras.

(Sūtra 28) The question discussed is whether the Śruti pe mits अभक्ष्यभक्षण without any restriction in the case of all Prānavids.

The Pūrvapaksa is — The Śruti allows one engaged in Prāṇavidyā to eat any अभक्ष्य. It goes without saying therefore that one intent upon the far more important Brahma-vidyā should be allowed this concession.

The Siddhānta is — Even the Brahmavids can have recourse to अभक्ष्यभक्षण only when their life is in grave danger; there can be no question of any Prāṇavid claiming this concession.

(Uṣasti Cākrāyana indulged in अभक्ष्यभक्षण as a last resort, when his life could not be saved otherwise.)

इभ्यः — इभं (elephant) अर्हतीति, one rich enough to maintain an elephant; perhaps the chief of the village (Patil or Patel) is meant. मटची — Hail-shower.

[491] The eighth Adhikaraṇa comprises four Sūtras.

(Sūtra 32) The question discussed is whether the sacrificial Karmans etc., (which are useful for securing Brahmavidyā, and hence are विद्याङ्ग) are to be performed even by those who go in for Āśrama-dharmas only, and are not desirous of securing Moksa.

The Siddhānta is — These Karmans are prescribed by the Śāstras as Nitya Karmans, and so they must be duly performed, even if there is no desire for Mokṣa.

(Sūtra 33) Further, such Karmans are useful in producing Vidyā, and can be looked upon as co-workers of vidyā.

(Sūtra 34) These Karmans can be described as both Nitya (obligatory, being prescribed by the Śāstras) and Anitya (voluntary, being useful for विद्योत्पत्ति for those who crave for Mokṣa), their case is similar to that of Agnihotra etc., which are Nitya (यावज्जीवमग्निहोत्रं जुहोति), and also Anitya, being meant for those who crave for Svarga (स्वर्गकामो जुहुयात्). Thus the Karmans are both विद्यार्थ and आश्रमार्थ.

(Sūtra 35) These Karmans remove the obstacles in the way of Vidyā, and produce the necessary चित्तशुद्धि; they are enjoined upon those who go in for Vidyā or Jñāna.

[492] The ninth Adhikaraṇa comprises four Sūtras.

(Sūtra 36) The question discussed is whether those who unfortunately could not claim to belong to some Āśrama, are competent to go in for Brahmavidyā.

[The Anāśramins are :— (1) A Brahmacārin who has not entered the Gṛhasthāśrama; (2) a house-holder who has lost his wife and has not married again; (3) a Parivrājaka who has not cultivated Vairāgya (detachment from worldly affairs).

The Pūrvapakṣin says — The Anāśramins are beyond the pale of any Āśrama; they can have no competence (Adhikāra) for the Brahmavidyā.

The Siddhānta is — The Anāśramins have the Adhikāra. Raikva was a Brahmavid, before he was able to secure a wife; Bhīṣma and Saṁvarta were life-long Brahmacārins (Saṁvarta officiated as the priest at the sacrifice of King Marutta, when his brother Bṛhaspati instigated by Indra declined to officiate), and other Anāśramins are known to be ब्रह्मविद्यानिष्ठ.

(Sūtra 37) The *Manusmṛti* also supports the Siddhānta. These Anāśramins were able to master Brahmavidyā, thanks to their practising Japa, Upavāsa (fasting), worship of the Deities etc.

(Sūtra 38) विशेषैः, अनुग्रहः. The विशेषs are तपस्, श्रद्धा etc.

(Sūtra 39) All things considered, it is better to belong to some Āśrama and to perform the prescribed duties conscientiously. It is wrong to shirk

one's responsibility, even when one has the competence to shoulder it. An आपद्धर्म must be regarded as exceptional.

[493] The tenth Adhikaraṇa comprises four Sūtras.

(Sūtra 40) The question discussed is — What is the position of those who, having deliberately opted for the life of a life-long Brahmacārin, or of a Forest-dweller (Vaikhānasa), or of a Saṁnyāsin, have ceased to be faithful to their ideals?

[494] (Sūtra 41) The Siddhānta is—There is no ray of hope for them. The Śāstra is quite specific and unequivocal on the point. As is clearly stated in Atrismṛti there is no Prāyaścitta for them.

अधिकारलक्षण—the sixth Adhyāya of the Pūrvamīmāṁsā.

(Sūtra 42) The Pūrvapakṣin points out that some Ācāryas regard the loss of celibacy by a life-long Brahmacārin, as a minor sin (Upapātaka) and admit a Prāyaścitta in that case. मधुवत्—the Prāyaścitta for the partaking of honey is the same in the case of the ordinary and life-long Brahmacārins. Such a procedure may well-nigh obtain in the case of other Aśramas also.

(Sūtra 43) The Siddhānta is—Prāyaścittas hold good only in the case of those who are not qualified for Brahmavidyā; they only remove the obstacles in the way of securing Svarga-loka. This is quite clear from the Smṛti-passages, and the code of conduct for the Śiṣṭas.

[495] The eleventh Adhikaraṇa comprises two Sūtras.

(Sūtra 44) The question discussed is whether the Udgītha-upāsanās and others which form a part of the Karman, are to be gone through by the Yajamāna, or by the priest.

Ātreya, representing the Pūrvapakṣa, says that Yajamāna is the Kartṛ, because in the case of the Upāsanās, both the Phala (the removal of the obstacles) and the Upāsanā belong to the same person. Where the sacrificial act is impossible to be performed by the Yajamāna, it may be done by the priest, (as for instance, the carrying of the fire or water in the Godohana vessel. This function is specifically allotted to the Adhvaryu priest; and so, even though the Yajamāna is entitled to the Phala, this task cannot be performed by him. In the present case, however, the Yajamāna can act as the Kartṛ).

(Sūtra 45) The Siddhāntin says — In the case of the Godohana, the Yajamāna does not perform the act, not because he is physically unable to do so, but because the services of the sacrificial priest, so to speak, are purchased by the Yajamāna for such acts. In the case of the Udgītha-upāsanā, the same position holds good; the priest is there to perform the necessary functions.

The general rule to be followed in such cases is — One who is qualified to perform a particular sacrifice, is alone qualified to go through the Upāsanās associated with that (In the case of Daharopāsanā and others which are not कर्माङ्ग, it is the Yajamāna who is the Kartṛ, because the Phala accrues to him).

[496] The twelfth Adhikaraṇa comprises three Sūtras.

(Sūtra 46) The *Bṛha*-passage तस्माद्ब्राह्मणःपाण्डित्यं निर्विद्य बाल्येन तिष्ठासेत्। बाल्यं च पाण्डित्यं च निर्विद्याथ मुनिः, is discussed at length.

The question is — How many injunctions are found here? Three (in respect of बाल्य, पाण्डित्य and मौन), or two (बाल्य and पाण्डित्य only) ?

The Pūrvapakṣin says—There is no injunctive expression like स्यात् after मुनिः, so मौन cannot be enjoined; it is merely an Anuvāda of the Jñāna understood from पाण्डित्य. Only two Vidhis are intended here, बाल्य and पाण्डित्य (which includes मौन) The Siddhānta is — Just as sacrifices, Sama, Dama, Contemplation etc., are the co-operating agencies for the Vidyā, the three Bālya, Pāṇditya and Mauna are to be understood as Sahakāri-agencies here.

Mauna can also mean प्रकृष्टमनन (associated with sages like Vyāsa); though there is no actual विधिप्रत्यय after अथ मुनिः, such a Mauna being Aprāpta, deserves to be enjoined here.

By resorting to the three, Bālya, Pāṇḍitya and Mauna, one can hope to be Brahman-knower. So, Mauna must be understood to be the third Sahakārin of Vidyā.

[497] (Sūtra 47) The objector points out that the passage अभिसमावृत्य कुटुम्बे... says that a person on the completion of his studies should become a house-holder; after passing his whole life as a house-holder in the proper way, he ultimately goes to Brahmaloka. Here is no reference to Mauna which is a characteristic of the Parivrājaka stage of life.

The answer is that the Vidyā is to be pursued in all Āśramas; the passage simply means that all Āśramas including the Gṛhasthāśrama are useful in their own way.

(Sūtra 48) Similarly, the *Bṛha*-passage referring to Brāhmaṇas turning their backs upon लोकैषणा, पुत्रैषणा etc., and taking to भिक्षाचर्य, is really intended to refer to the duties of all Āśramas, which are the Sahakārins of Vidyā, like Mauna as shown above.

[498] Only one Sūtra in the thirteenth Adhikaraṇa.

(Sūtra 49) The passage बाल्येन तिष्ठासेत् is discussed here. What is meant by बाल्येन ? Does it mean the innocent nature of a child, free from guile or ostentation, or its wayward behaviour unregulated by any rules?

The Pūrvapakṣin (who has a sense of humour, or is a simpleton pure and simple) opines that just as a child behaves at its sweet will (in the matter of urinating etc.), the Vidvat is free to do what he likes and should not bother himself about prohibitory injunctions like सुरां न पिबेत्; for, they are contradicted by the special injunction बाल्येन तिष्ठासेत्.

The Siddhānta is — बाल्य means the innocent nature of a child. The Vidvat should not give himself airs, should not advertise his merits and so forth.

[499] Only one Sūtra in the fourteenth Adhikaraṇa.

(Sūtra 50) The question discussed is whether the Vidyā (with its fruit, material prosperity here) is able to produce its effect, immediately after the Karmans are performed, or after a lapse of time.

The Pūrvapakṣa view is that the Vidyā should be in a position to deliver the goods immediately it is secured.

The Siddhānta is — There can be no hard and fast rule in this connection. It would all depend upon the obstacles present in a particular case. If there is present some more powerful Karman, the fruit would be delayed. The very fact that the Śruti says with reference to the Udgītha-Vidyā, there is no obstacle in the way of its fruit, shows that the absence of obstacles can not be guaranteed everywhere.

[500] Only one Sūtra in the fifteenth Adhikaraṇa.

(Sūtra 51) The मुक्तिफला-विद्या also, like the अभ्युदयफला-विद्या takes effect, subject to the force of the obstructing agencies. It is true that the Karman, the means of the मुक्तिफला is bound to be normally most powerful, but it is not unlikely that in the case of a few Brahmavids, some evil Karman done in the former births may cause some delay.

तदवस्थावधृतेः—प्रतिबन्धाभावप्रतिबन्धसंप्राप्तिरूपावस्थाधृतेः ।

Rāmānuja's interpretation of Sūtras 50 and 51, leaves much to be desired. The expression मुक्तिफला seems to have been borrowed from the *Sūtra* मुक्तिफलानियमः. Rāmānuja places both the Vidyās on the same level, as regards the fruit being delayed by some obstructing cause. This is against the Śruti ब्रह्मविद् ब्रह्मैव भवति which ensures instantaneous fruition for the Brahmavid.

Śaṅkara takes ऐहिक to include आमुष्मिक as well, and remarks तस्मात्, ऐहिकमामुष्मिकं वा विद्याजन्मप्रतिबन्धक्षयापेक्षयेति स्थितम् ।

There is no doubt that मुक्तिफलानियमः means 'Unconditioned मुक्तिफल', 'मुक्तिफल having no strings attached to it.' The force of एवं is this — As the ऐहिक and आमुष्मिक fruits are hedged in by some restrictions, there is no restriction regarding the मुक्तिफल which is absolutely unfettered (एवं is associated with the idea of वैधर्म्य).

Śaṅkara says — यथा मुमुक्षोर्विद्यासाधनावलम्बिनः साधनवीर्यवशाद्विद्यालक्षणे फल ऐहिकामुष्मिकफलत्वकृतो विशेषप्रतिनियमो दृष्टः, एवं मुक्तिलक्षणेऽप्युत्कर्षापकर्षकृतः कश्चिद्विशेषप्रतिनियमः स्यादित्याशङ्कयाह— (As no question of delay is possible in the case of मुक्तिफल, Śaṅkara makes the doubt of the Pūrvapakṣin refer to उत्कर्ष and अपकर्ष in the Mukti itself) एवं मुक्तिफलानियम इति। न खलु मुक्तिफले कश्चिदेवंभूतो विशेषप्रतिनियम आशङ्कितव्यः। कुतः? तदवस्थावधृतेः। मुक्त्यवस्था हि सर्ववेदान्तेष्वेकरूपैवावधार्यते। ब्रह्मैव हि मुक्त्यवस्था, न च ब्रह्मणोऽनेकाकारयोगोऽस्ति।

Śaṅkara's interpretation appears to be convincing.

Nimbārka says that मुक्तिफलानियमः means that Mukti may take place after the fall of the present body, or after the fall of many subsequent bodies, taking his stand upon the Sruti-passage तस्य तावदेव चिरं ..But this ignores completely the passage ब्रह्मविद् ब्रह्मैव भवति।

This Quarter contains the discussion of some interesting matters, such as the role of Saṁnyāsins, and how far the Saṁnyāsin could flout the Śāstric injunctions in respect of अभक्ष्यभक्षण etc. The Sūtrakāra stands by the Śruti which says that the Saṁnyāsins are beyond the jurisdiction of the rules governing the other three Āśramas. But the fact that such a discussion was found necessary shows that there must have been a number of bogus Saṁnyāsins in those times, who abused their privileges. The Sūtrakāra could only point out that such renegades could not claim any protection from the Śruti.

IV. 1

The fourth Adhyāya is usually called the Phalādhyāya, as it discusses Mokṣa in all its aspects, which is the fruit of Vidyā.

The first few Adhikaraṇas of the first Pāda continue the topic (the means for the Brahmavidyā) from the previous Adhyāya.

The first Adhikarana comprises two Sūtras.

[501] (Sūtra 1) In various Sruti-passages, वेदन is mentioned as the means for securing Brahman. The question is whether this वेदन is to be gone through only once or is to be repeated till the attainment to Brahman.

The Pūrvapaksin says:— In ordinary cases like the pounding of coarse rice to remove the husk, we actually see that the pounding has to be continued till the rice-husk is removed. Brahman is imperceptible; there is no reason to believe that the वेदन must be repeated (if one वेदन is incompetent to give its fruit, mere duplication of the वेदन would not improve matters) to attain to Brahman. So, वेदन once gone through ought to suffice.

The Siddhānta is:— वेदन does not mean mere knowledge; it includes Dhyāna (contemplation) and Upāsana (worship). The Śruti-passages make it clear that वेदन, चिन्तन, ध्यान, उपासन mean one and the same thing, by introducing a topic with उपासन and वेदन and ending it with वेदन, उपासन, ध्यान etc.

(Sūtra 2) The *Visnupurāṇa* also endorses the same. षड्भिरङ्गैः—The six अङ्ग्s are :— यम, नियम, आसन, प्राणायाम, प्रत्याहार and धारणा.

Read the following from Śankara's comments :—

भवेदावृत्त्यानर्थक्यं तं प्रति यस्तत्त्वमसीति सकृदुक्तमेव ब्रह्मात्मत्वमनुभवितुं शक्नुयात्। यस्तु न शक्नोति तं प्रत्युपयुज्यत एवावृत्तिः।...न हि दृष्टेऽनुपपन्नं नाम। दृश्यन्ते हि सकृच्छ्रुताद्वाक्यान्मन्दप्रतीतं वाक्यार्थमावर्तयन्तस्तत्तदाभासव्युदासेन सम्यक्प्रतिपद्यमानाः। ...येषां पुनर्निपुणमतीनां नाज्ञानसंशयविपर्ययलक्षणः पदार्थविषय प्रतिबन्धोऽस्ति, ते शक्नुवन्ति सकृदुक्तमेव तत्त्वमसिवाक्यार्थमनुभवितुमिति तान्प्रत्यावृत्त्यानर्थक्यमिष्टमेव। ...यस्य तु नैषोऽनुभवो द्रागेव जायते तं प्रत्यनुभवार्थ एवावृत्त्यभ्युपगमः। तत्रापि न तत्त्वमसिवाक्यार्थात्प्रच्याव्यावृत्तौ प्रवर्तयेत्। न हि वरघाताय कन्यामुद्वाहयन्ति।

[502] The second Adhikaraṇa comprises only one Sūtra.

(Sūtra 3) The question discussed is — Whether Brahman is to be meditated upon as different from the worshipper (or meditator) or as the Ātman of the worshipper. (Saṅkara has no difficulty in explaining the Sūtra as advocating the identity of Brahman and Ātman).

The Pūrvapaksin says — The Brahmasūtras themselves have advocated that Brahman is different from Ātman (II. 2·22, III. 4 8, I-1·14 etc.). So, Brahman should be meditated upon as different from Ātman.

The Siddhānta is:—

प्रत्यगात्मन् is the Ātman of the शरीर; likewise the परब्रह्मन्, of the प्रत्यगात्मन्. This is made clear in the Jābāla-Sruti,—

त्वं वा अहमस्मि ... अहं वै त्वमसि.

सर्वस्य चिदचिद्वस्तुनस्तच्छत्ता.... the whole world (both sentient and non-sentient) is the body of the Paramātman, from whom it is produced, in whom it gets dissolved, through whom it is active and by whom it is controlled.

The शरीर (denoted by the word मनुष्य) is the प्रकार of the जीव (प्रकारिन्) and ultimately refers to जीव; similarly जीव (denoted by the word अहं) is the प्रकार of the परमात्मन्, and ultimately refers to the परमात्मन्.

The objector says that he can understand अहं वै त्वमसि, because जीव (denoted by the word अहं) is the body of the परमात्मन् and so ultimately refers Brahman; but what about त्वं वा अहमस्मि (त्वं referring to परमात्मन् is not surely the body of the Jīva) ? The answer is — The objector need not be so hyper-critical. After all, all words अहं, त्वं etc., ultimately denote the Paramātman, as has been already made sufficiently clear.

As regards the Śruti-passages pointing to ऐक्य as well as difference between Jīva and Brahman, it is clear that there is तात्पर्यभेद involving गुणगुणिभेद. The श्रुति itself says अकृत्स्न एषः implying that the Highest alone is कृत्स्न (all-perfect).

[503] The third Adhikaraṇa comprises two Sūtras.

(Sūtra 4) (Vallabha reads प्रतीकेन in place of प्रतीके न and interprets the Sūtra to mean that symbol-worship can not produce Mokṣa). Saṅkara takes Sūtra 4 as forming a separate Adhikaraṇa. प्रतीक means a symbol, representative.

The question is :— In the injunction मनो ब्रह्मेत्युपासीत (where is involved symbol-worship), which is the उपास्य,—मनस् or Brahman ?

The Pūrvapakṣin says— In the last Sūtra, आत्मेति was taken to mean that आत्मन् is the उपास्य; so here ब्रह्मन् should be the उपास्य.

The answer is — In प्रतीकोपासनाs, the प्रतीक is the उपास्य: the प्रतीक again is not the Ātman of the उपासक.

(Sūtra 5) The objector argues that if one were asked to choose as उपास्य between मनस् and Brahman, one is not likely to choose an insignificant entity like Manas, in preference to the all-powerful Brahman.

The Siddhānta is — Manas is to be looked upon as Brahman, because normally we find that as a matter of courtesy an inferior entity is looked upon as a superior one and not vice versa. No one would dare to look upon a King as a servant, but a King's servant is often courteously looked upon as the King himself, and this courtesy is known to pay.

[504] The fourth Adhikaraṇa comprises only one Sūtra.

(Sūtra 6) The Sruti-passage under discussion is य एवासौ तपति तमुद्गीथमुपासीत... The question is whether उद्गीथ is to be looked upon as आदित्य, or आदित्य as उद्गीथ.

The Pūrvapakṣin says — In the last Sūtra, the rule was laid down that there should be उत्कृष्टदृष्टि on a निकृष्ट entity. Now उद्गीथ is a फलसाधन, being directly

the कर्माङ्ग, while आदित्य is not a फलसाधन; hence उद्गीथ is superior to आदित्य. Again in the expression य एवासौ तपति, यः being used first brings to our mind आदित्य who is the proper उद्देश्य here. This means there should be आदित्ये, उद्गीथदृष्टिः.

The Siddhānta is — Even a child knows that आदित्य is superior to उद्गीथ. The Pūrvapakṣin should better stop arguing for the sake of mere opposition. It is again not a universal rule that what is stated first is more important or is the उद्देश्य. Even Pāṇini does not observe such a rule (in the Sūtra वृद्धिरादैच्, though the word वृद्धि comes first, it is not the उद्देश्य).

[**505**] The fifth Adhikaraṇa comprises five Sūtras.

It lays down certain directions for carrying out the meditation in the most effective manner. Saṅkara remarks that these directions can only be associated with Upāsanās other than those connected with sacrificial acts or directly with सम्यग्दर्शन (कर्माङ्गसंबद्धेषु तावदुपासनेषु कर्मतन्त्रत्वान्नासनादिचिन्ता, नापि सम्यग्दर्शने वस्तुतन्त्रत्वाद्विज्ञानस्य).

(Sūtras 7, 8) A sitting posture is commended for purposes of meditation (उपासनं...न च तद्गच्छतो धावतो वा संभवति, गत्यादीनां चित्तविक्षेपकरत्वात्। तिष्ठतोऽपि देहधारणे व्यापृतं मनो न सूक्ष्मवस्तुनिरीक्षणक्षमं भवति। शयानस्याप्यकस्मादेव निद्रयाभिभूयेत। Śaṅkara).

(Sūtra 9) The Śruti-passage ध्यायतीव पृथिवी ... clearly shows ध्यान to be associated with अचलत्व.

(Sūtra 10) The *Gītā* amplifies the same idea.

(Sūtra 11) Śaṅkara takes this Sūtra as a separate Adhikaraṇa in order to accommodate the Śruti-passage समे शुचौ ... which contains some specific suggestions.

The meditator is given full latitude in the choice of time, place etc., for his meditation. Whatever would lead to concentration, he should adopt. The Svetāśvatara-passage makes some detailed suggestions no doubt, but they are not binding; the Sūtrakāra refers to this by the expression अविशेषात् (तद्गतेषु विशेषेष्वनियम इति सुहृद्भूत्वा, आचार्य आचष्टे। Śaṅkara).

[**506**] The sixth Adhikaraṇa comprises only one Sūtra.

(Sūtra 12) The meditation is to be carried on till the Soul's departure from the body. For आ प्रयाणात्, Śaṅkara and others read आ प्रयाणात्, Rāmānuja all the same explains आ प्रयाणात्, as आ मरणात्. The Pūrvapakṣin here apparently wants the उपासन to be carried out in one day; in Sūtra 1, the आवृत्ति was to be gone through only once.

[**507**] With the seventh Adhikaraṇa which comprises only one Sūtra, the link with the last Adhyāya is ended, and discussion about the विद्याफल commences.

(Sūtra 13) There are three kinds of Karman :—

(1) आरब्ध — which has started giving its fruit, as a result of which the present body is resorted to by the Jiva.

(2) संचित — past Karmans which have not as yet begun to produce their effect.

(3) आगामि — future Karman.

The objector says :— In view of the explicit statement in the Smṛti that no Karman can be destroyed unless its fruit is experienced, the संचित Karman cannot be overcome by the विद्या which is the means for ब्रह्मप्राप्ति. So, the absence of contact with the furure sin, and the destruction of the previous sin must be understood as meant for the glorification of Vidyā.

The answer is — Such is the power of Vidyā that it enables one to get rid of उत्तराघाश्लेष and to destroy पूर्वाघ as declared by the Śruti.

It must be remembered that the expression नाभुक्तं क्षीयते कर्म *simply* describes the inherent power of Karman and refers to what is the normal procedure. Actually it is the अप्रीति of the Paramātman for an evil-doer, which causes the fruit of the Karman to be experienced. But for one who has secured the right knowledge (एवंविदि पापं कर्म न श्लिष्यते), there is no अप्रीति of the Paramātman. Thus the two passages refer to two different situations.

The आगामि sin can only be the result of some unconscious fault, and so that cannot hurt one who has secured विद्या.

[508] The eighth Adhikaraṇa comprises only one Sūtra.

(Sūtra 14) The last Sūtra was concerned with अघ (sin). This Sūtra states what the position is with reference to the पुण्यकर्मन्.

The Siddhānta is that the पुण्यकर्मन् is also on a par with the पाप (whatever stands in the way of विद्या, whether पुण्य or पाप, is पाप according to the Śāstra). The only difference is that while पाप ceases to exist immediately when there is विद्याप्राप्ति, पुण्य ceases to exist only after the fall of the body.

पाते तु — विदुषः शरीरपाते मुक्तिरित्यवधारयति (शङ्कर).

— *पाते मुमुक्षोरारब्धकर्मावसानशरीरपाते तु, इतरस्य...पुण्यापुण्यकर्मणः, असंश्लेषः (श्रीकण्ठ).*

— पाते भक्तिमार्गे भगवद्भावात् च्युतिः पात इत्युच्यते । ...तुशब्दोक्त्या, अस्मिन्मार्गे पापस्य व्यवच्छेद एव (वल्लभ).

Nimbārka reads the Sūtra as इतरस्याप्येवमश्लेषः पाते तु.

[509] The ninth Adhikaraṇa comprises only one Sūtra.

(Sūtra 15) The सुकृतदुष्कृतs that have not started giving their fruit, cease to exist when the fall of the body takes place.

कुलालचक्रवत् — *The potter's wheel goes on revolving even when the* दण्ड which started the motion is taken off, by its own momentum (the आरब्धकर्मन् automatically goes on functioning till the fall of the body).

[510] The tenth Adhikaraṇa comprises three Sūtras.

(Sūtra 16) The question discussed is what exactly the position is in respect of the नित्यकर्मन्s like the Agnihotra, and the नैमित्तिककर्मन्s, when the विद्याप्राप्ति has taken place.

The Pūrvapakṣin says that obviously the नित्य and नैमित्तिक Karmans (having an independent fruit of their own) have no purpose to serve after विद्या is secured.

The Siddhānta is :— Agnihotra etc., which are नित्य Karmans stand on a different level; the previous सुकृत ceases to have anything to do with the Vidvat. Agnihotra etc., actually help the Vidyā as is clear from the Śruti. Besides, failing to do the नित्यकर्मन्s would adversely affect the Vidyā which has already been secured. (This is a very unsatisfactory argument. Vidvat surely is not bound down by any Āśramakarmans, but the Sūtrakāra has to yield to the universal popular acceptance of the नित्य Karmans as being compulsory for a person as long as he lives).

(Sūtra 17) Apart from the previous पुण्यकर्मन् to his credit, the Vidvat may go in for some साधुकृत्या like the performance of a sacrifice for bringing on rain (कारीरि-इष्टि). Now this साधुकृत्या does not help the Vidyā. This साधुकृत्या is appropriated by the friends of the Vidvat, and the दुष्कृतs go to the enemies, according to the authors of some recensions. (This rough and ready method of disposing of the सुकृतदुष्कृतs is entirely unphilosophical, but the Sūtrakāra has no other alternative left to him, in view of the specific Sruti passage).

उभयोः — पूर्वोत्तरयोः पुण्यकर्मणोः (रामानुज); जैमिनिबादरायणोराचार्ययोः (शङ्कर).

(Sūtra 18) The Śātyāyanaka makes it clear that the appropriation of the साधुकृत्या of the Vidvat, by the friends, is for the sake of ensuring that the fruit of the Karman gone through does not affect the Vidvat.

[511] The last Adhikaraṇa (11th) comprises only one Sūtra.

(Sūtra 19) विद्यायोनिशरीर—The body of the Vidvat when he has secured the Vidyā. According to Rāmānuja there may be one or more bodies taken to by the Vidvat, before he becomes मुक्त.

Commentators like Rāmānuja, who understand by the Vidvat, the devotee of the Highest, find some difficulty in reconciling the various Śruti-*passages describing the role played by the नित्यकर्मन्s, the सुकृत* and दुष्कृत that have not started giving their fruit, the fall of the body or bodies etc., in the case of the Vidvat. Śaṅkara quietly takes the whole discussion here (as well as similar topics dealt with in the remaining three Pādas of the fourth Adhyāya) as referring to the Vidvat who has secured the सगुणविद्या, or as dealing with the Lower Brahman. Read the following comments of Śaṅkara on Sūtras 16-19—न हि ब्रह्मविद् आगाम्यग्निहोत्रादि संभवति, अनियोज्यब्रह्मात्मत्वप्रतिपत्तेः शास्त्रस्याविषयत्वात्। सगुणासु तु विद्यासु कर्तृत्वानतिवृत्तेः संभवत्यागाम्यप्यग्निहोत्रादि। ... तस्माद्विद्यासंयुक्तं नित्यमग्निहोत्रादि विद्याविहीनं चोभयमपि मुमुक्षुणा मोक्षप्रयोजनोद्देशेनेह जन्मनि जन्मान्तरे च प्राग्ज्ञानोत्पत्तेः कृतं...ब्रह्मविद्यया सहैककार्यं भवतीति स्थितम्। ... मिथ्याज्ञानावष्टम्भं हि कर्मान्तरं देहपात उपभोगान्तरमारभते, तच्च मिथ्याज्ञानं सम्यग्ज्ञानेन दग्धमित्यतः साध्वेतत्, आरब्धकार्यक्षये विदुषः कैवल्यमवश्यं भवतीति।

IV. 2

This Pāda describes the condition after death of the Vidvat. According to Śaṅkara this description applies to the devotee of the Lower Brahman, on the very convincing grounds that in the case of one who has realised the Highest Brahman, oneness with Brahman is immediately attained (ब्रह्मविद् ब्रह्मैव भवति) and there could be no coming and going in the case of Moksa which is नित्य and is not something that is to be acquired anew.

As there are Sruti-passages describing the course after death all the same, the Sūtrakāra takes notice of them.

[512] The first Adhikaraṇa comprises two Sūtras.

(Sūtra 1) The question discussed is what is the meaning of संपद्यते in वाङ् मनसि संपद्यते...

The Pūrvapaksin says—As Manas is not the material cause of Vāk, there cannot be the merging of Vāk into it (a कार्य alone can be merged into the कारण); so, what gets merged is the functioning of the Vāk.

The Siddhānta is that the वाक्स्वरूप, not वाग्वृत्ति, gets merged into Manas (the Sruti uses the word वाक् and not वाग्वृत्ति). A *dying man, although becoming speechless, continues to have his mind functioning.* Actually it would be better to explain संपद्यते as संयुज्यते (becomes associated with it).

According to Sankara, it is the वाग्वृत्ति that is merged in the mind (वृत्तिवृत्तिमतोरभेदोपचारात्). It is only the वृत्त्युपशम that is intended here.

(Sūtra 2) There is similarly संयोग of other sense organs with the Manas.

उपशान्ततेजाः— one who is dying.

[513] The second Adhikaraṇa comprises only one Sūtra.

(Sūtra 3) The Manas in conjunction with the sense-organs becomes connected with Prāṇa.

The Pūrvapaksin argues that Manas is the Kārya of Anna, and Prāṇa that of waters. So, it is possible to say that Manas gets merged into waters, through Anna (which is पृथिवीरूप and पृथिवी is the Kārya of waters).

The Siddhānta is that here also संपद्यते means संयुज्यते. Anna and waters are not the material caüse of Manas and Prāṇa which are merely nourished by them.

आप्यायन— augmenting, nourishment.

[514] The third *Adhikarana comprises only one Sūtra.*

उपगम — connection; by आदि are to be understood उत्क्रान्ति, प्रतिष्ठा, and तेज संपत्ति.

[515] The fourth Adhikarana *comprises two Sūtras.*

(Sūtra 5) पृथिवीमयः — connected with पृथिवी.

(Sūtra 6) प्राणस्तेजसि — here तेजस् means तेजस् conjoined with other elements; each one of the elements by itself is unable to function.

[516] The fifth Adhikaraṇa comprises seven Sūtras.

अनुपोष्य—अदग्ध्वा (अन् + gerund of उष् to burn, with उप)

(Sūtra 7) The question is whether the departure from the body goes through the same procedure in the case of the Vidvat and the Avidvat.

The Pūrvapaksin says—The departure takes place in the case of the Avidvat only. For, the Śruti says that the Vidvat secures immortality here and now.

The Siddhānta is that both the Vidvat and the Avidvat go through the same process till the entrance into the Nāḍī when their paths bifercate (the Vidvat passing out of the 101st Nāḍī in the head, and the Avidvat passing out of the eye, head or other parts of the body).

In the passage ब्रह्म समश्नुते etc., अमृतत्व means only the absence of connection with the past and future sins; and ब्रह्मन् means the realisation of Brahman at the time of Upāsanā.

[517] (Sūtras 8) The Sruti makes it quite clear that there persists the connection with the body (the Saṁsāra-state) till the Devayāna path is reached.

(Sūtra 9) The subtle body accompanies the Vidvat. The *Kausītaki* describes the Vidvat as conversing with the Moon, even when the gross body is no more. This shows that the subtle body must be there.

(Sūtra 10) The अमृतत्व referred to in the Sruti-passage does not arise, as the cessation of bondage with the Saṁsāra has not taken place.

(Sūtra 11) Actually the body is found to be warm sometimes, after death; this can certainly be due to the existence of the subtle body in the case of the Vidvat (this is a very unsatisfactory argument).

[518] (Sūtra 12) The Pūrvapaksin again points out that in the case of the Vidvat, the Sruti definitely rules out Utkrānti :—

Having described the Utkrānti in the case of the Avidvat (who is कामयमान, full of desires) the Śruti describes the Vidvat (who is अकामयमान) in the passage, न तस्य प्राणा उत्क्रामन्ति, ब्रह्मैव सन्ब्रह्माप्येति, as having no उत्क्रान्ति.

Likewise, Yājñavalkya when asked by Ārtabhāga tells him that the Prānas of the dying man do not go out of the body, but are merged in the body itself.

This clearly shows that the Vidvat secures immortality in this world itself.

The Siddhānta is — न प्राणानामुत्क्रान्तिः — In this passage what is repudiated is the उत्क्रान्ति of the Prāṇas *from the Pratyagātman*, not the उत्क्रान्ति *from the body.* In the passage न तस्य प्राणा उत्क्रामन्ति, तस्य refers to the शारीर, the matter in hand, *not* the शरीर which is not mentioned in the Śruti.

न तस्य प्राणा उत्क्रामन्ति — The Pūrvapaksin supplies here the अपादान, शरीर from which something is to go out. The Siddhāntin supplies जीवात्, and argues as

follows:—It is true that तस्य (gen. sing.) goes with प्राणs, but there is no point in understanding like that, because जीव is surely connected with the प्राणs only and not with any other entity, and there is no propriety in telling people what is well-known. So, it is better to suppose that तस्य means here तस्मात् (meaning जीवात्, as no अपादान is mentioned directly). After all, the genitive can be understood to give the sense of any case ! Do we not use the expression नटस्य शृणोति ? Or, we might as well say that तस्य refers to the general idea of अपादान, and तस्मात् emphasises its particular aspect.

If the objector is still not satisfied, we draw his attention to the reading न तस्मात्प्राणा ... in the Mādhyandina recension. When the body ceases to exist, the Prāṇas get separated from the Vidvat; the Prāṇas hold on till the Vidvat's attainment to Brahman by following the Devayāna path.

As regards the questions asked by Ārtabhāga to Yājñavalkya, they obviously concern the Avidvat (if they concern the Vidvat, the refutation would be on the lines chalked out above).

Questions by Ārtabhāga		*Answers by Yājñavalkya*
कति ग्रहाः ?—(ग्रह—Indriyas)		— अष्टौ ग्रहाः
कति, अतिग्रहाः ? (अतिग्रह—Objects of sense)—		अष्टावतिग्रहाः
कतमे ते ?— ग्रह,	अतिग्रह	— प्राणो वै ग्रहः, सोऽपानेन, अतिग्रहेण, गृहीतः, अपानेन हि गन्धाञ्जिघ्रति । etc.,
प्राण,	अपान	
वाक्,	नामन्	
जिह्वा,	रस	
चक्षुस्,	रूप	
श्रोत्र,	शब्द	
मनस्,	काम	
हस्त,	कर्मन्	
त्वक्,	स्पर्श	
कास्विद्देवता यस्या मृत्युरन्नम् ?		— अग्निर्वै मृत्युः, सोऽपामन्नम्
यत्रायं पुरुषो म्रियते किमेनं न जहाति ?		— नामेत्यनन्तं वै नाम, अनन्ता विश्वे देवा, etc.

(*All this is for the edification of the Avidvat*).

(Sūtra 13) The Smṛtis also describe the Vidvat as departing from the Nāḍī in the head.

ब्रह्मलोक — The world of *हिरण्यगर्भ; परां गतिम्* — ब्रह्म.

[519] The sixth Adhikaraṇa comprises only one Sūtra.

(Sūtra 14) The question is whether the subtle elements enveloping the Jīva go straightaway to do their job of furnishing a suitable body for the Jīva in accordance with his Karman, or they first are merged into the Paramātman for a while.

The Siddhānta is that the subtle elements get connected with the Paramātman, as the Sruti expressly says तेजः परस्यां देवतायाम्—

Just as in the states of deep-sleep and dissolution, the activity of the subtle elements is at a stand still, so here also there is a cessation of the activity for some time.

[520] The seventh Adhikaraṇa comprises only one Sūtra.

(Sūtra 15) This close connection of the subtle elements with the Paramātman is not of the nature of merging, but is just अपृथग्भावः; for, the same expression संपद्यते (which was used in connection with वाक्) is used here. There is no reason why that expression should be taken here in a different sense (अभिधानवैरूप्य—different meaning) such as लय; for, at the time of departure (उत्क्रान्ति) there is no purpose served by getting merged into the Paramātman, nor is there any mention in the Śruti of any emergence of a fresh creation in case there was a लय.

So far, the Vidvat and the Avidvat take to the same path after the departure from the body. Afterwards their courses are different.

[521] The eighth Adhikarana comprises only one Sūtra.

(Sūtra 16) — The Sruti says that the Vidvat goes out by the 101st Nāḍī in the head, while the Avidvat goes by any of the other Nāḍīs.

The Pūrvapakṣin says that it would be better to assume that there is no hard and fast rule about the Nāḍī to be made use of. The Nāḍīs are so many and so subtle; it would be difficult for the departed Jīva to choose a particular Nāḍī out of them.

The Siddhānta is that the Vidvat, owing to the power of his Vidyā, can easily make the proper choice. Further, there is the tip of the heart glowing, thus providing the Vidvat with sufficient light. It must not be forgotten that the Vidvat is all along favoured by the Paramātman staying in his heart (हृदि).

[522] The ninth Adhikaraṇa comprises only one Sūtra.

(Sūtra 17) The Sruti describes the Vidvat after the departure from the body as going up, following the rays of the Sun only. As the Śruti uses the expression एतैरेव रश्मिभिः, there can be no question of the Vidvat having any discretion in the matter. He has to go by following the rays, not in any other manner.

The objector points out that at night time, the Sun's rays do not shine so the poor Vidvat is likely to be stranded, if we interpret the passage literally.

The answer is that even at night time, the Sun's rays are not totally absent (they are not experienced as giving out their full warmth). Again, the Śruti makes it quite clear that the Sun's rays extend to both the worlds, like a royal road joining two cities.

[523] The tenth Adhikaraṇa comprises only one Sūtra.

(Sūtra 18) The Pūrvapaksin points out that he may agree that there do exist the Sun's rays at night to help the Vidvat, but such a contingency is hardly likely to arise, for the Śāstra categorically censures death at night time; so, one dying at night time cannot attain to Brahman.

The Siddhānta is — The attainment to Brahman has nothing to do with the time of death. As has been already pointed out, Brahmaprāpti is due to the fact that the अनारब्धकर्मन् is destroyed by the विद्या, the future Karman is unable to contact the Vidvat, and the प्रारब्धकर्मन् refers only to the last body This being the case, the references to the time of death concern only the Avidvat What causes going down or a lower status is the connection with Karman, which is absent in the case of the Vidvat. So, the expression दिवा च शुक्लपक्ष etc., refers to the Avidvat.

[524] The eleventh Adhikarana comprises two Sūtras

(Sūtra 19) Just as dying at night does not affect adversely the Brahmaprāpti, dying during the Daksināyana (December 21 to June 20) is of no consequence

The Pūrvapaksin points out that one dying during the Daksināyana goes to the Moon, and he returns when his Karman is exhausted, and there is no Brahmaprāpti in his case. The very fact that Bhīsma (of the Mahābhārata fame) waited till the Uttarāyana began, to end his life shows that death during the Daksināyana is censurable.

तेषां तत्पर्यवैति—According to the Pūrvapaksin तेषां means ज्ञानिनां as well as कर्मिणाम्, and तत् means कर्मन्.

The Siddhānta is — The passage refers to the Avidvats and तत् simply means what leads a person to the Moon-world. Again, the passage तस्माद्ब्रह्मणो महिमानमाप्नोति shows that the Vidvat even after going to the Moon does attain to Brahman, as nothing can bind him down to Samsāra Bhīsma was a great Yogin and had the power to regulate his time of death. That only shows that dying during the Uttarāyana is praiseworthy and no special importance is associated with it. So, the references to the return from the Moon etc, are valid in the case of the Avidvat only.

The objector points out that the *Gitā* actually uses the word काल, and shows how there take place आवृत्ति and अनावृत्ति in the case of the Vidvat

(Sūtra 20) The Siddhāntin says —

(1) The passage in question in the *Gitā* does not refer to मरणकाल at all, as determining the return (if death occurs at night) and non-return (if death occurs during day).

(2) यत्र काले actually means यत्र मार्गे, and तं कालं, तं मार्गम्.

(3) अग्नि, ज्योतिस् etc, धूम, रात्रि etc, refer to their supervising Deities, these Deities point out to the Devayāna and the Pitryāna as the paths to be followed respectively by those seeking salvation, and those seeking earthly prosperity.

(4) Deities अग्नि etc, show the Devayāna to the Vidvat, irrespective of the fact of his dying at night in the dark fortnight during the Daksināyana, just as the Deities Dhūma etc, point out the Pitryāna to the Avidvat irrespective of his dying during day in the bright fortnight during the Uttarāyana.

(5) The word काल in effect means the कालाभिमानी देवता or the guide.

(6) The *Gītā*, after all, is a Smṛti work and cannot override the Śruti; the passage in question concerns the Yogins mainly and is intended to remind the reader of the Devayāna and the Pitṛyāṇa.

It is instructive to see how the different Bhāṣyakāras try to interpret the Sūtras so as to find out from them their own views. Thus Madhva finds in Sūtras 7–14, a discussion about the natures of Viṣṇu and Lakṣmī, and the question whether Lakṣmī or Prakṛti is merged in Viṣṇu or not (He also reads समना in place of समाना), explains अनुपोष्य as स्वत एव, अनुपोष्य. अविभाग as परमेश्वरकामाद्यविभाग and so on.

Vallabha refers to the Puṣṭimārga and Maryādā-mārga (which corresponds to the path followed by the worshipper of the Lower Brahman, as described by Saṅkara).

Broadly speaking, the various Śruti-passages refer to four classes of people taking to different courses after death—

(1) Those who become Mukta, immediately they realise Brahman (for these, there is no going anywhere after death).

(2) Those whose Jīvas leave by the 101st Nāḍī in the head, and who take to the Devayāna path.

(3) Those who have good Karman to their credit go by the Pitṛyāṇa, to the Moon and return to the mortal world, after their Sukṛta is exhausted.

(4) The evil-doers go to Yamaloka, and are born again and again as worms, lower animals etc. (Only No. 2 is dealt with in this Pāda. Nos. 3 and 4 have been treated in the previous Pādas).

The Sūtrakāra seems to hold the view that the two paths Devayāna and Pitṛyāṇa do not emphasise the time when death occurs, and it is only the Smṛti like the *Bhagavadgītā* that attaches some importance to the time of death. The expression स्मार्ते चैते implies that after all the description found in the Smṛti-works is not as authoritative as that found in the Śruti. Again, the time factor is meant to be attended to only by Yogins who are able to fix the time of their death by their special powers.

स्मार्ते चैते—योगसाङ्ख्ये न श्रौते (शङ्कर).
—योगसाङ्ख्ये न प्रत्यक्षश्रुतिविहिते (भास्कर).
—सतिद्वयं स्मर्यते (निम्बार्क).

Śankara is forced to take एते as referring to Yoga and Sāṅkhya (the two paths Devayāna and Pitṛyāṇa are mentioned in the Śruti, and so they cannot be described as स्मार्ते or न श्रौते). It seems to us that the last Sūtra (योगिनः प्रति...) was added later on by some one taking his cue from the passage in the *Bhagavadgītā*. (एते—शुक्लकृष्णे गती ह्येते, नैते सृती पार्थ जानन्योगी मुह्यति कश्चन *Gītā* 8·26–27).

IV. 3

In this Pāda, the Devayāna path is described in detail. The various Sruti-passages are reconciled and a complete picture of the path is presented. As all the Śruti-passages are of equal value, an attempt is made, as was done in the Guṇopasaṁhāra Pāda (III. 3), to accommodate the divergent statements in this connection, by arguments sometimes crude, but often ingenious. Then follows a description of the nature of the Brahman reached. (Read the article 'Devayāna and Pitryāṇa,' by R. D. Karmarkar, published in the Proceedings of the Third All-India Oriental Conference, Madras.)

[525] Sūtras 1-5 describing the Devayāna path are divided into four Adhikaraṇas (each of the first three Sūtras forms an Adhikaraṇa by itself, and Sūtras 4-5 comprise the fourth Adhikaraṇa).

(Sūtra 1) The Devayāna path (Devayāna by itself means the Devapatha — the path by which the gods acting as guides take the Jīvas to their destination. Brahmapatha — the path leading to Brahman) is described in various ways in the Upaniṣads *Chāndogya*, *Kauṣītaki* and *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*. As it is not possible to ignore any Sruti passage (because all such passages are equally authoritative), ways and means are found to bring all the details in one coordinated scheme as follows :—

(1) Arcis (Agniloka to be explained as a Karmadhāraya compound, अग्निश्च लोकश्च, and not अग्नेः लोकः)

(2) Day

(3) The Bright fort-night

(4) Uttarāyaṇa (December 21 to June 20, the six months when the Sun takes to the northernly course)

(5) The Year

(6) Vāyu (Devaloka)

(7) Aditya

(8) Candramas (the Moon)

(9) Vidyut

(10) Varuṇa

(11) Indra

(12) Prajāpati

(13) Brahman.

Though the details differ in different Śruti-passages, some giving more constituents and some less, there can be no hesitation in concluding that the path described is the same, known as Arcirādi.

[526] (Sūtra 2) The Kauṣītakins put in वायुलोक as No. 2 after Arcis (अग्निलोक). This would mean that Day would come after वायु: but this conflicts with the idea categorically expressed that there should be ऊर्ध्वगमन throughout. So, we must put in वायुलोक before आदित्यलोक.

वायु must come after संवत्सर (वायु is mentioned elsewhere as the abode of the gods; so वायु can be identified with देवलोक).

[527] (Sūtra 3) The objector says that वरुण should be placed after वायु in accordance with the Kauṣītaki-text; for, वायु cannot come after अर्चिस्, nor after विद्युत् (because the non-human person there takes the Jīva straight to Brahman). The order from अर्चिस् to विद्युत् is, however, more or less fixed; but as provision must be somehow made for वरुण, as also for इन्द्र and प्रजापति, some order has to be disturbed, and the best way out of the difficulty is to place Varuṇa after विद्युत्. The position is that Vidyut and Varuṇa are both connected with water (Varuna is the lord of waters) and so should be near each other, but why should Varuna be placed *after* Vidyut, and not *before*?

The answer is that Vidyut is more directly and obviously connected with water, and so Vidyut should come first !

[528] (Sūtra 4) The question discussed is :—What do अर्चिस् etc, the constituents of the Devayāna represent ? Are they the sign-posts, or the places for enjoyment, or the guides who take the persons desirous of attaining to Brahman to their goal ?

The objector says that Arcis etc , are the sign-posts because we do find sign-posts on a big road for helping a traveller to reach his destination. If this view is not acceptable, as Day, Fort-night etc., indicate only the time element and not any signs or places as such, Arcis etc., may be looked upon as भोगभूमिs (as the *Kauṣītaki* actually uses the expressions अग्निलोक etc.).

The Siddhānta is—Arcis etc., must be understood to mean 'the supervising Deities', because they have to act as guides as the expression ... स एतान्ब्रह्म गमयति shows. It is true that the expression गमयति is used first with reference to the वैद्युत-पुरुष, but the context shows that the idea applies to the previous members Arcis etc., as well.

(Sūtra 5) It is the वैद्युत-पुरुष who acts as the guide as directly mentioned. We must suppose therefore that वरुण etc., play the role of being merely अनुग्राहक (co-helpers).

After Sūtra 4, Śankara and others read an additional Sūtra, उभयव्यामोहात्तत्सिद्धेः. (Vallabha reads an additional Sūtra after Sūtra 3, वरुणाचाधीन्द्रप्रजापती, so as to give prominence to इन्द्र and प्रजापति). According to Śankara, the Sūtra उभय...means that there is the necessity for the help by the guides as both (उभय) the Jīvas and the Stations on the way are incapable of finding the way for themselves.

वल्लभ — भगवानेव कांश्च व्यामोहयति ज्ञानिनः, मर्यादामार्गीयभक्तांश्च, अतस्तत्कामनासिद्धतत्फलभोग इति ।

श्रीकर — [illegible]

विज्ञानभिक्षु— गन्तुरुपासकस्य देवयानपितृयाणयोरुभयोः पथोर्व्यामोहाद् विशिष्यापरिचायकानां सर्वत्रातिवाहिकानां देवाना सिद्धिरित्यर्थः ।

[529] The fifth and the last Adhikaraṇa contains ten Sūtras. Sūtras 6–10 give the view of Bādari; Sūtras 11-13, the view of Jaimini; and Sūtras 14–15 the view of Bādarāyaṇa, which is the Siddhānta.

The *question discussed is :—Which worshippers* are taken to Brahman by the guides?—Worshippers of Hiraṇyagarbha, or only the worshippers of the Highest Brahman; or worshippers of the Highest Brahman and the worshippers of the Pratyagātman with Brahman as the Antaryāmin?

(Sūtra 6) Bādari says that the Arcirādi-guides take the worshipper of Hiraṇyagarbha (or, Brahmadeva) by the Devayāna path; for, the worshipper of the Highest Brahman is not required to go anywhere (the attainment to Brahman is automatic); a movement towards is possible only in the case of something that is परिच्छिन्न, while Brahman is अपरिच्छिन्न.

(Sūtra 7) The expressions ब्रह्मलोकान्, प्रजापतेः सभा वेश्म, show that the worshipper goes to the worlds of Brahmadeva.

(Sūtra 8) The passage स एनान् ब्रह्म गमयति, uses the expression ब्रह्म (neuter), not ब्रह्माणं (ब्रह्मदेवं). This shows that Brahmadeva is not referred to here — This objection can be met with in the following way:—Brahmadeva (Hiraṇyagarbha) is the first-born and so very near to Brahman. Hence he could be referred to as Brahman! (Besides, it has been already pointed out that Brahman being अपरिच्छिन्न, *cannot be gone to*).

[530] (Sūtra 9) At the time of Pralaya, when the Brahmaloka is destroyed, the Vidvat reaches the Highest Brahman and there is no return for him.

(Sūtra 10) The Smṛti also says the same thing viz. when the प्रतिसंचर (प्रलय) occurs, the worshippers reach the highest place.

[531] (Sūtra 11) Jaimini holds the view that the Brahman reached *is the Highest Brahman; for, that is the primary sense of the word Brahman.* It is true Brahman is नित्य and सर्वगत, but it can be spoken of as being *particularised by* some *Time-factor* or *Place-factor.*

As regards the contention that ब्रह्मलोकान् suggests the worlds of Brahmadeva, it can be argued that Brahmaloka means here, Brahman itself is the Loka (that is, ब्रह्मलोक is a Karmadhāraya compound; it is cumbrous to take an expression as a Bahuvrīhi compound, when a Karmadhāraya is possible. For instance, निषादस्थपतिः if dissolved as निषादानां स्थपतिः, would put one in mind of two entities (निषाद् and स्थपति), which is cumbrous; but निषादश्च स्थपतिश्च would refer to only one entity, if taken as a Karmadhāraya and thus is more acceptable.)

The Śruti also supports this view. अदितिः पाशान्, here actually one पाश *is spoken of as many.*

Brahman, which is परिपूर्ण, सर्वगत etc., can have various worlds associated with it, by its own free will. (अत्यन्ताय means 'totally').

(Sūtra 12) The Śruti by using the expression परं ज्योतिः shows that the Highest Brahman is meant.

[532] (Sūtra 13) The passage यशोऽहं भवामि ब्राह्मणानाम् also refers to the Para-Brahman (यशस् means आत्मन् and अहं means the inner Controller, परमात्मन्).

Further, ब्रह्मलोक is described as अकृत, and so it cannot mean the world of Brahmadeva.

[533] (Sūtra 14) Bādarāyaṇa gives his own view as the Siddhānta thus —

(1) It is wrong to say that the worshippers of the Kārya Brahman are taken along the Arcirādi path, because the Sruti says परं ज्योतिरुपसंपद्य.

(2) It cannot be said either that only the worshippers of the Para-Brahman are taken, because there is the Sruti-passage declaring that those who know the Five-Fire-Vidyā are taken by the Arcirādi path (Both these views – 1 and 2 – are thus faulty).

(3) It is better, therefore, to conclude that the worshippers of (or, meditators on) the Para-Brahman barring those who worship Brahman under some symbol (who worship Nāman etc., the symbols of Brahman as Brahman, or Nāman etc., as the symbols of Brahman), — the प्रतीकालम्बन-worshippers have no right to be called the worshippers of the Highest Brahman.

(4) The general rule, whatever will (to sacrifice or to worship) one has, one attains to that after death, clearly states the position. —The worshippers of Pañcāgnis go by the Arcirādi path and attain to Brahman. The Symbol-worshippers, on the other hand, go in for a somewhat mixed Upāsanā, and are not entitled to travel by the Arcirādi path.

(Sūtra 15) The Symbol-worshippers are described in the Sruti as securing only a limited objective, not Brahman

प्रकृतिवियुक्तं — apart from the subtle elements. (The passage ब्रह्मणा सह ते सर्वे... in the *Kūrmapurāna* refers to the Yogins in the world of Brahmadeva and not the travellers along the Arcirādi path).

According to Sankara, the last two Sūtras form a separate Adhikaraṇa (6). The view of Bādari is the Siddhānta viz. the souls are guided to the Lower Brahman, as going to is not possible in the case of the Parabrahman. These worshippers of the Lower Brahman in due course attain to the Highest Brahman, along with Hiraṇyagarbha, the Lord of Brahmaloka.

Jaimini's view is that the destination is the Para-Brahman to which the Karmins are taken. (There is no word like तु in the Sūtra परं जैमिनिर्मुख्यत्वात्, to show that Jaimini's view is the Pūrvapakṣa or is intended to be refuted). It appears to us that the Sūtrakāra had to refer to Jaimini who was too big a person to be ignored, while discussing the nature of Mokṣa. (In IV. 4.5, similarly Jaimini's view is referred to). Śaṅkara very astutely remarks :— तस्मात् 'कार्यं बादरिः', इत्येष एव स्थितः पक्षः। 'परं जैमिनिः' इति तु पक्षान्तरप्रतिभानमात्रप्रदर्शनं प्रज्ञाविकासनायेति द्रष्टव्यम्। Saṅkara also reads उभयथा, अदोषात्, in Sūtra 15 and says प्रतीकालम्बनान्वर्जयित्वा सर्वानन्यान्विकारालम्बनान्नयति ब्रह्मलोकमिति बादरायण आचार्यो मन्यते। न ह्येवमुभयथाभावाभ्युपगमे कश्चिद्दोषोऽस्ति। ... तत्क्रतुश्चास्योभयथाभावस्य समर्थको हेतुर्द्रष्टव्यः।

Saṅkara is usually attacked for regarding कार्यं बादरिः as the Siddhānta-Sūtra, and for taking Jaimini's view as the Pūrvapakṣa, which is not the usual order to be followed in the respective positions of the Pūrvapaksa and the

Siddhānta. We have already suggested above that it is not necessary to regard Jaimini's view as the Pūrvapakṣa, and Bādarāyaṇa's view points out to an exception to Bādari's view. Śaṅkara spiritedly remarks (Sūtra 14, न च कार्ये...) न ह्यसत्यपि संभवे मुख्यस्यैवार्थस्य ग्रहणमिति कश्चिदाज्ञापयिता विद्यते। ... केचित्तुनः पूर्वाणि पूर्वपक्षसूत्राणि भवन्त्युत्तराणि सिद्धान्तसूत्राणीत्येतां व्यवस्थामनुरुध्यमानाः पराविद्या एव गतिश्रुतीः प्रतिष्ठापयन्ति, तदनुपपन्नं गन्तव्यत्वानुपपत्तेर्ब्रह्मण... Śaṅkara is on firm ground in arguing that any interpretation *must take into account what is possible and reasonable*, and one must not follow blindly any hard and fast rule.

Reviewing the Sūtras in this Pāda (IV-3) as a whole, it is clear that they can be divided into three Sections :—

(1) Sūtras 1-6 describe the Devayāna path by which the Brahman-worshippers proceed after death.

(2) Sūtras 7-13 describe the destination (or, Gantavya) of the Brahman-worshippers.

(3) The last two Sūtras mention the authoritative view of Bādarāyana, *excluding the Symbol-worshippers from enjoying the privilege of using the* Devayāna-path.

Rāmānuja takes Section 2 (Sūtras 7-13) as referring to the Gantṛs, and not to the Gantavya. He, therefore, takes कार्य to mean 'the worshippers of Kārya' which is quite unjustifiable (perhaps he was forced to give this meaning to Kārya, as Sūtra 14 refers to the Gantṛs).

There is nothing to show that Bādari's view is the Pūrvapakṣa and that of Jaimini the Siddhānta. Actually, Jaimini who is a confirmed Karmamārgin is only indirectly interested in Parabrahman, and his view could not possibly be regarded as the Siddhānta. But as Jaimini and Bādarāyaṇa were very well-known philosophers, Jaimini, the Sūtrakāra thought, deserved mention, when *the destination of the Vidvat was being discussed. Bādari obviously wants all* Brahman-worshippers (whether worshipping Brahman directly or under a *Symbol) to be placed on the same* pedestal. Bādarāyaṇa improves upon this and declares that the Symbol-worshippers could not attain to the same destination as the Direct-Brahman-worshippers, as that comes into conflict with the Tat-kratu-nyāya.

Nimbārka and Keśava Kāśmīrin follow Śaṅkara generally. Madhva does the same and makes it clear that Bādari and Jaimini represent the Pūrvapakṣa.

Read the following comments of the different Bhāṣyakāras, on अप्रती-कालम्बनान् and उभयथा दोषात्.

निम्बार्क — अर्चिरादिगणः प्रतीकालम्बनव्यतिरिक्तान् परब्रह्मोपासकान्, ब्रह्मस्वरूपदासस्वरूपोपासकांश्च परं ब्रह्म नयति। ...उभयथा दोषात्—उभयथा श्रुतिव्याकोपः स्यात्।

वल्लभ — शुद्धब्रह्मत्वं ज्ञात्वा य उपास्ते तमेव ब्रह्म प्रापयतीति बादरायण आचार्यो मन्यते। प्रतीके यद्ब्रह्मस्वरूपं तमात्मत्वेनैव, उपासनार्थं च ब्रह्मत्वेन भजते, एवमुभयथाऽपि दोष संपद्यते, इति तस्य न ब्रह्मप्राप्त्यधिकारोऽस्तीति युक्तं तदक्रतुन्यायात्।

विज्ञानभिक्षु — अप्रतीकालम्बनानेव, केवलब्रह्मविदोऽपि, तेऽप्रतीकालम्बनाः, विदुः ब्रह्म नयति ब्रह्मलोकान्प्रापयत्येवगण, अर्थात्, प्रतीकालम्बनान् हिरण्यगर्भादि ब्रह्मोपासकान् कार्यब्रह्मलोके भोगार्थं प्रलयपर्यन्तं स्थापयतीति बादरायणो मन्यते, उभयथाऽदोषात्।

IV. 4

The fourth Pāda of the fourth Adhyāya discusses the nature of Mokṣa which is secured by those who are entitled to use the Devayāna path, the relation of the Released Souls with the Highest, and their functions and responsibilities.

[534] The first Adhikaraṇa comprises three Sūtras

(Sūtra 1) The question discussed is whether the Mukta after being merged into the Para-jyotis becomes manifest as possessing a new form, or his own natural form.

The Pūrvapakṣin says that obviously a new form must be there, if nothing new or additional is to be gained by the Mukta, what purpose is served by the Mokṣaśāstra ? If the Mukta is to have nothing more than his own nature, then Mokṣa would not be worth having. The Sruti itself describes Mokṣa as not merely the cessation of misery, but infinite bliss, knowledge etc. So, the expression स्वेन रूपेण must be taken to mean 'with the peculiar nature involving infinite bliss, which had not been there before, and which was acquired anew.' Surely one's स्वरूप is always there, it cannot be said to be manifest or acquired at any stage.

The Siddhānta is — The expression स्वेन रूपेण must mean 'by his own nature'. If some new or peculiar form is to be secured by the Mukta, स्वेन रूपेण would be meaningless. A surely is not expected to manifest himself by the form of B, or by some new form.

[535] (Sūtra 2) The Pūrvapakṣin reads too much in the expression अभिनिष्पद्यते. What is conveyed by the expression is that the Mukta is free from any connection with the body or Karman, and there is the manifestation of his own nature.

[536] (Sūtra 3) The Pūrvapakṣin says .—If mere स्वरूपाविर्भाव exists in the state of Mokṣa, what difference can be there between the state of deep sleep (where there is no connection with the outside world) and the state of Mukti ?

The answer is that in the state of Mukti, there is the manifestation of the natural attributes, अपहतपाप्मत्व, सत्यसंकल्पत्व etc., which is lacking in the Suṣupti -state. In short, there is the विकास of the attributes ज्ञान, आनन्द etc., which had been cramped up on account of the shackles of Karman prior to Mukti.

[537] The second Adhikaraṇa comprises only one Sūtra

(Sūtra 4) The question discussed is—What is the relation between the Paramātman and the Mukta ? Does the Mukta-Jīva consider himself to be different from the Paramātman (who is his Atman), or as not different from him, being just the mode of the Paramātman (just as the body is the प्रकार of the Jīvātman, so the Jīvātman is the प्रकार of the Paramātman) ?

The Pūrvapakṣin says — The Mukta obviously remains separate from the Paramātman—

(1) The Sruti-passage सोऽश्नुते... सह ब्रह्मणा shows that the Mukta-Jīva enjoys *along with* Brahman: that means the Mukta and Brahman are two different entities.

(2) ...परमं साम्यमुपैति
(3) ...मम साधर्म्यमागताः
} The *expressions* साम्य *and* साधर्म्य *presuppose* two different entities; there can be no साम्य or साधर्म्य with oneself.

The Siddhānta is — The Sruti सोऽश्नुते... really means that the Jīvātman, when Mukta, enjoys just the realisation of the true nature of Brahman. By admitting the प्रकारप्रकारिभाव between the Mukta and the Paramātman, साम्य and साधर्म्य can be adequately explained.

[538] The third Adhikaraṇa comprises three *Sūtras (5–7) and gives* the views of Jaimini, Auḍolomi and Bādarāyana about the nature of the Atman, manifested in the state of Mukti.

(Sūtra 5) Three possible views about the nature of Ātman in the *state of Mukti would be—the possession*

(1) of the qualities अपहतपाप्मत्वादि,
(2) of only विज्ञान (not अपहतपाप्मत्वादि);
(in both these, there is no question of non-sentiency being associated),
(3) of both अपहतपाप्मत्वादि and विज्ञान.

Jaimini holds the first view, because the qualities अपहतपाप्मत्वादि are mentioned in connection with Brahman (ब्रह्मण इदं ब्राह्मम्), and these are associated with the Pratyagātman as well, in the Prajāpati-discourse etc., in the *Chāndogya*, and eating, sporting etc, are associated with him. If only विज्ञान were to be the nature, eating etc., would not be possible.

[539] (Sūtra 6) Auḍulomi (the same who is mentioned in I. 4.21) holds the second view viz, only विज्ञान is the nature, as the Śruti emphatically says that the Ātman is विज्ञानघन एव, प्रज्ञानघन एव etc. As regards the qualities अपहतपाप्मत्वादि mentioned in the Śruti, they can be explained as denying the existence of qualities opposed to them. Thus :—

अपहतपाप्म means that Brahman is free from पाप्मन् of any kind
विजर means freedom from old age
विमृत्यु means freedom from death
विशोक, अविजिघत्स, अपिपास mean freedom from misery, hunger and thirst.
सत्यकाम—having no *desires not fulfilled at any time; and so on.*

[540] (Sūtra 7) Bādarāyaṇa holds that as the Śruti mentions both विज्ञानघनत्व and अपहतपाप्मत्वादि, and as the Śruti is the final authority, both the views, that of Jaimini, and that of Auḍulomi must be accepted.

It would be wrong to dub any of the two views as impossible, or as due to Avidyā. When we say विज्ञानघन एव, that means there is not even the smallest part of Ātman that is non-sentient. The एवकार means that the absence of connection with विज्ञान is not found in any part of the Atman: that is, एवकार is

अयोगव्यवच्छेदार्थक and not अन्ययोगव्यवच्छेदार्थक (that is, referring to the absence of other qualities), because that would come into conflict with several positive statements in the Śruti. A mass of salt is known to be saltish by the tongue, but the form etc., of the mass can be known by the eye; a mango-fruit is रसवत्, but its skin etc., have रसभेद; similarly Ātman can have विज्ञानस्वरूपत्व as well as स्वप्रकाशस्वरूपत्व.

Śaṅkara has a very short comment on this Sūtra — एवमपि पारमार्थिकचैतन्यमात्रस्वरूपाभ्युपगमेऽपि व्यवहारापेक्षया पूर्वस्याप्युपन्यासादिभ्योऽवगतस्य ब्राह्मस्यैश्वर्यरूपस्याप्रत्याख्यानादविरोधं बादरायण आचार्यो मन्यते।

[541] The fourth Adhikaraṇa comprises two Sūtras.

(Sūtra 8) The question discussed is — Is the activity of the Mukta (who is सत्यसंकल्प) due to his संकल्प alone or does it depend upon any additional effort or agency?

The Pūrvapakṣin says — In practical life, we find kings and others (who are सत्यसंकल्प) have to take recourse to some additional effort (such as ordering their servants) for getting things done. So, the activity of the Mukta should also be प्रयत्नान्तरसापेक्ष.

The Siddhānta is —The Mukta by his mere संकल्प can get what he wants; no other effort is needed, as the Śruti itself vouchsafes.

संकल्पादेव — Here the एवकार is अन्ययोगव्यवच्छेदार्थक as there is no other Sruti-passage speaking of any प्रयत्नान्तर. If there had been such a Sruti-passage, the एवकार would have been only अयोगव्यवच्छेदार्थक, so as to accommodate that Sruti-passage. In the case of विज्ञानघन एव, the एवकार had to be taken as अयोगव्यवच्छेदार्थक, so as not to come into conflict with the Śruti mentioning the qualities सत्यकामत्व etc.

(Sūtra 9) The Mukta has no one to boss over him. He is स्वराट् (self-ruler). (This does not repudiate the over-all supremacy of the Paramapuruṣa).

Śaṅkara takes this and the remaining Adhikaraṇas as describing the Vidvat who has realised only the Lower Brahman; for, according to him the Vidvat who has realised the Highest Brahman becomes one with it, and no further details are required about him.

[542] The fifth Adhikaraṇa comprises seven Sūtras.

The question discussed is whether the Mukta has a body and sense-organs, and if so, whether he creates them and different worlds at his will, whether he could be called omniscient etc.

(Sūtra 10) Bādari holds the view that the Mukta has no body or sense-organs, as connection with these is bound to be associated with misery which the Mukta surely does not experience.

[543] (Sūtra 11) Jaimini holds that the Mukta has a body and sense-organs, because the Śruti actually says that Ātman becomes three-fold, five-fold etc. This reference must be associated with the body, as the Ātman

is incapable of being divided. The Śruti अशरीरं वाव सन्तं प्रियाप्रिये न स्पृशतः must be understood to refer to a body not in the state of Mokṣa, but to the ordinary body which is subject to Karman producing happiness and misery.

[544] (Sūtra 12) Bādarāyana says as the Śruti endorses both सशरीरत्व and अशरीरत्व, we must conclude that the Mukta at his will can have a body or not.

द्वादशाह—*A sacrifice extending over twelve days.*

सत्र is a long sacrificial session, where there are several Yajamānas, and where the injunctions used are आसीरन् (connected with the root अस्) or उपेयु. (connected with the root इ with उप्) etc.

अहीन—a sacrifice extending over several days where there is only one Yajamāna, and the injunction is याजयेत् (connected with the root यज्) etc.

A द्वादशाह sacrifice can be associated with both kinds of विधिs; so it depends upon the sacrificer to decide at the commencement whether he wishes to perform a Satra or an Ahīna.

(Sūtra 13) When the Mukta wills that he should have no body, he carries on with the body and sense-organs created by the Lord, as in a dream.

[545] (Sūtra 14) The Paramapurusa sometimes creates the world of Pitṛs for the enjoyment by the Mukta, as in the waking state. The Mukta also can himself create such worlds if he likes.

Śaṅkara's comments on Sūtras 13 and 14 are more to the point :—यदा तनोः सेन्द्रियस्य शरीरस्याभावः, तदा यथा संध्ये स्थाने शरीरेन्द्रियविषयेष्वविद्यमानेष्वप्युपलब्धिमात्रा एव पित्रादिकामा भवन्त्येवं मोक्षेऽपि स्युरेवं ह्येतदुपपद्यते। ...भावे पुनस्तनोर्यथा जागरिते विद्यमाना एव पित्रादिकामा भवन्त्येवं मुक्तस्याप्युपपद्यते।

Śaṅkara takes Sūtras 15 and 16 as a separate Adhikaraṇa.

[546] (Sūtra 15) The question discussed is — Ātman is atomic in size; *how can he function in several bodies simultaneously?*

According to Śaṅkara the question is :—विभावादिष्वनेकशरीरसर्गे किं निरात्मकानि शरीराणि दारुयन्त्राणीव सृज्यन्ते, किंवा सात्मकान्यस्मदादिशरीरवदिति भवति वीक्षा। तत्र चात्ममनसोर्भेदानुपपत्तेरेकेन शरीरेण योगादितराणि शरीराणि निरात्मकानीति।

Rāmānuja's reference to Ātman being atomic in size is hardly pertinent while considering the relation of the Ātman with *different* bodies.

The atomic size of the Ātman in respect of the body has already been dealt with in II. 3.

As a lamp situated in one place envelops all places by its lustre, or as the Ātman though situated in the heart etc pervades the whole of the body by his sentiency, the Ātman can very well pervade different bodies.

प्रदीपवत् — the simile is explained by other commentators as under :—

यथा प्रदीप एकोऽनेकप्रदीपभावमापद्यते विकारशक्तियोगात्, एवमेकोऽपि सन्विद्वानैश्वर्ययोगादनेकभावमापद्यते सर्वाणि शरीराण्याविशति। (शङ्कर)

यथा तैलवर्तिसंयोगभेदे तत्र तत्राविशति प्रदीपस्तथा सर्वशक्तित्वात्सर्वेषु शरीरेषु चेतनामनसोः सद्भावः। (भास्कर)

[552] (Sūtra 21) The परमसाम्य of the Mukta with Brahman, comprises just the privilege of realising Brahman as it is, that is all.

[553] (Sūtra 22) The Pūrvapakṣin is afraid that if the Mukta is completely under the control of the Paramapuruṣa, it may happen that he would be required to go back to the Saṁsāra, if the Paramapuruṣa so wills it.

The answer is that the Paramapuruṣa who regards the Mukta (Jñānin) as one dearest to him, could not be so thoughtless. A return to the Saṁsāra can possibly arise from Karman, longing or Vāsanā associated with the Mukta. But all these three could not exist in the case of the Mukta. In the *Bhagavadgītā* the Lord himself has given such a specific assurance, and who could possibly question the word of the Lord ?

It is usual to criticise adversely Sankara's position in respect of this last Pāda which according to Śaṅkara describes the state of the Vidvat meditating on the Lower Brahman only. It is claimed that the Sūtrakāra could not have concluded his Sūtras with the description of the lower Vidvat ! Against this it must be clearly understood that the business of the Sūtrakāra appears to be to describe the philosophical position obtaining in the Upaniṣads and not to preach a system of his own. Hence, the views of Bādari, Jaimini and others from whom Bādarāyaṇa differs, are given due prominence. As far as Śaṅkara is concerned, the higher Vidvat becomes one with the Highest Brahman and there is no room to discuss his state any further; it is the lower Vidvat whose fate deserves to be discussed in the light of popular superstition and relevant philosophical data from the Upaniṣads. Śankara cannot therefore be blamed for believing that Sūtras IV. 4.1–7 alone describe the higher Vidvat.

According to Madhva, the Released Soul experiences only joy and never suffers pain. Vallabha also sees in this Pāda, the two-fold distinction among the devotees, those following the Puṣṭimārga and those following the Maryādāmārga. On the whole, however, the Bhāṣyakāras do not differ very much in the interpretation of the individual Sūtras in this Pāda.

शरीरमनुप्रविश्यापि...पुण्यानेव भोगाननुभवन्ति न तु दुःखादीन्,। 'यथा प्रदीपो दीपकादिषु प्रविष्टस्तत्स्थं तैलाद्येव भुङ्क्ते । (मध्व)

यथैकः प्रदीपोऽनेकासु दशास्वंशतः प्राविशति, एवमेव सिद्धस्य चित्तं स्वांशैरनेकेषु स्थूलदेहेष्वाविशति । (विज्ञानभिक्षु)

इयान् विशेषः—The मुक्त-Jīva is to be distinguished from the बद्ध-Jīva as follows:—The बद्ध-Jīva has a limited knowlege and so cannot have jurisdiction on bodies other than his own; the मुक्त-Jīva's knowledge is unlimited, and so at his will he could control other bodies. In the case of the बद्ध-Jīva, Karman is the regulating agency; in the case of the मुक्त-Jīva, his will regulates his conduct.

[**547**] (Sūtra 16) The Pūrvapakṣin points out that the Sruti-passage प्राज्ञेनात्मना etc., says that the मुक्त knows neither बाह्य nor आन्तर; so, how can he be described as omniscient ?

The answer is — The passage in question does not refer to the मुक्त; it refers to tha सुषुप्ति-state, where the Jīva merges into the प्राज्ञ (the Paramātman) or to the state of death (where तेजस् is said to merge into the परा देवता).

[**548**] The sixth Adhikarana (with which the fourth and the last Adhyāya of Brahmasūtras, comes to an end) contains six Sūtras.

The question discussed is the nature of the privileges enjoyed by the Mukta who is described as attaining to परमसाम्य with the Highest.

(Sūtra 17) The Mukta cannot participate in the activity connected with the creation of the world etc. That is the privilege of the Highest alone. This is made perfectly clear by the Śruti-passages themselves in the relevant contexts. Again, such a question actually does not arise, for surely the Mukta could not have been there at the the time of the creation of the world.

The glory of the Mukta lies in his being able to realise the Highest Brahman as it is. This does not come into conflict with the idea of परमसाम्य. Brahman is unlimited bliss, and the Mukta also enjoys such a bliss. (In the passage एका कन्या दशेन्द्रियाणि, कन्या means the mind which illumines the objects of the sense; कन् — to illumine).

[**549**] (Sūtra 18) The *Chāndogya*-passage स स्वराड् भवति तस्य सर्वेषु लोकेषु कामचारो भवति, means that the Mukta, if he so wishes, can enjoy the different worlds supervised over by Hiranyagarbha and others. The Mukta can enjoy whatever is associated with the manifestations of Brahman, but that does not mean that he can control the world, like Brahman.

[**550**] (Sūtra 19) As the Mukta has realised the Brahman, he is not subject to any modification, though he could enjoy himself in the worlds that are subject to modification.

[**551**] (Sūtra 20) Both the Sruti (प्रत्यक्ष) and the Smṛti (अनुमान) definitely mention the जगद्व्यापार as the peculiar privilege of the Paramapuruṣa. The attributes सत्यसंकल्पत्व etc., associated with the मुक्त are ultimately dependent upon the Paramapuruṣa.

[552] (Sūtra 21) The परमसाम्य of the Mukta with Brahman, comprises just the privilege of realising Brahman as it is, that is all

[553] (Sūtra 22) The Pūrvapaksin is afraid that if the Mukta is completely under the control of the Paramapurusa, it may happen that he would be required to go back to the Samsāra, if the Paramapurusa so wills it

The answer is that the Paramapurusa who regards the Mukta (Jñānin) as one dearest to him, could not be so thoughtless A return to the Samsāra can possibly arise from Karman, longing or Vāsanā associated with the Mukta But all these three could not exist in the case of the Mukta In the *Bhagavadgītā* the Lord himself has given such a specific assurance, and who could possibly question the word of the Lord ?

It is usual to criticise adversely Sankara's position in respect of this last Pāda which according to Saṅkara describes the state of the Vidvat meditating on the Lower Brahman only It is claimed that the Sūtrakāra could not have concluded his Sūtras with the description of the lower Vidvat ! Against this it must be clearly understood that the business of the Sūtrakāra appears to be to describe the philosophical position obtaining in the Upanisads and not to preach a system of his own Hence, the views of Bādari Jaimini and others from whom Bādarāyana differs, are given due prominence As far as Sankara is concerned the higher Vidvat becomes one with the Highest Brahman and there is no room to discuss his state any further it is the lower Vidvat whose fate deserves to be discussed in the light of popular superstition and relevant philosophical data from the Upanisads Sankara cannot therefore be blamed for believing that Sūtras IV 4 1-7 alone describe the higher Vidvat

According to Madhva, the Released Soul experiences only joy and never suffers pain Vallabha also sees in this Pāda the two-fold distinction among the devotees, those following the Pustimarga and those following the Maryādāmārga On the whole, however the Bhasyakāras do not differ very much in the interpretation of the individual Sutras in this Pada

••••••••••••••••••••••

Appendix A

An Alphabetical Index of the

Adhikaraṇas

Usually, an Adhikarana is named after a word or words of the which commences the Adhikarana This rule is not followed everyw sometimes the Adhikarana is named after some word or topic more known in the initial Sutra

Sutra or Sūtras in the Adhikarana	Name of the Adhi-karana	The initial Sūtra
(४ २ ४)	अध्यक्षाधिकरण	सोऽध्यक्षे तदुपगमादिभ्य
(१ ३ ४२-४८)	अर्थान्तरत्वाधिकरण or आकाशोऽर्थान्तरत्वादिव्यपदेशाधिकरण	आकाशोऽर्थान्तरत्वादिव्यपदेशा
(३ २ २६ २९)	अहिकुण्डलाधिकरण	उभयव्यपदेशात्त्वहिकुण्डलवत्
(४ १ ३)	आत्मत्वोपासनाधिकरण	आत्मेति तूपगच्छन्ति ग्राहयन्ति च
(२ ३ १८)	आत्माधिकरण	नात्मा श्रुतेर्नित्यत्वाच्च ताभ्य
(२ १ १५ २०)	आरम्भणाधिकरण	तदनन्यत्वमारम्भणशब्दादिभ्य

Sutra or Sūtras in the Adhikarana	Name of the Adhi-karana	The ii Suc
(४ २ ७ १३)	आ सृत्युपक्रमाधिकरण	समाना च सृत्युपक्रमा सृतत्व चा
(४ १ १९)	इतरक्षपणाधिकरण	भागन त्वि क्षपयित्वाथ सपद्यते
(१ १ २८ ३२)	इन्द्रप्राणाधिकरण	प्राणस्तथा गमात्
(२ ४ १७ १९)	इन्द्रियाधिकरण	त इन्द्रियां तद्व्यपदेशा द्न्यत्र श्रेष्ठा
(२ २ २७ २९)	उपलब्ध्यधिकरण	नाभाव उप
(३ २ ११ २५)	उभयलिङ्गाधिकरण	न स्थानतोऽपि परस्योभयलि सर्वत्र हि
(२ २ ३१ ३४)	एकस्मिन्नसम्भवाधिकरण	नैकस्मिन्नस

Sūtra or Sūtras in the Adhikarana	Name of the Adhikarana	The initial Sutra
(३ २ ९)	कर्मानुस्मृति शब्दविध्यधिकरण	स एव तु कर्मानु स्मृतिशब्द विधिभ्य
(१ १ १)	जिज्ञासाधिकरण	अथातो ब्रह्म जिज्ञासा
(४ २ १८)	निशाधिकरण	निशि नेति चन्न
(४ २ १४)	परमपत्यधिकरण	तानि परे तथा ह्याह
(२ ३ ४० ४१)	परायत्ताधिकरण	परात्तु तच्छ्रुत
(२ २ ५ ३८)	पत्युरत्यधिकरण	पत्युरसामञ्ज स्यात्
(४ १ ४ ५)	प्रतीकाधिकरण	न प्रतीके न हि स
(१ ४ २३ २६)	प्रयोजनवत्त्वाधिकरण	न प्रयोजनवत्त्वात्
(२ ४ ६ ७)	प्राणाणुत्वाधिकरण	अणवश्च
(२ ४ १-४)	प्राणाधिकरण	अत एव प्राण
(२ ४ १ ३)	प्राणोत्पत्त्यधिकरण	तथा प्राणा
(४ २ ३)	मनोधिकरण	तन्मन प्राण उत्तरात्
(३ ४ १)	मुक्तिफलाधिकरण	एव मुक्तिफला नियम

Sūtra or Sūtras in the Adhikarana	Name of the Adhikarana	The initial Sūtra
(३ ३ ५९ ६४)	यथाश्रयभावाधिकरण	अङ्गेषु यथा श्रयभाव
(२ १ ३)	योगप्रत्युक्त्यधिकरण	एतेन योग प्रत्युक्त
(४ ३ ३)	वरुणाधिकरण	तडितोधि वरुण सभवात्
(२ ४ ८ ११)	वायुक्रियाधिकरण	न वायुक्रिये पृथगुपदेशात्
(३ ४ ३६ ३९)	विधुराधिकरण	अन्तरा चापि तु तद्दृष्टे
(२ ३ १ ९)	वियदधिकरण	न वियदश्रुते
(२ १ ४ १२)	विलक्षणत्वाधिकरण	न विलक्षणत्वा दस्य ...
(३ ३ ५६)	शब्दादिभेदाधिकरण	नाना शब्दादि भेदात्
(३ ३ ५१ ५२)	शरीरे भावाधिकरण	एक आत्मन शरीरे भावात्
(२ १ १२)	शिष्टापरिग्रहाधिकरण	एतेन शिष्टापरि ग्रहा
(२ ४ १२)	श्रेष्ठाणुत्वाधिकरण	अणुश्च
(१ ४ ११ १३)	सङ्ख्योपसंग्रहाधिकरण	न सङ्ख्योपसंग्रहा दपि
(१ ४ २९)	सर्वव्याख्यानाधिकरण	एतेन सर्वे व्याख्याता

Appendix B

An Alphabetical Index of the Sūtras

Appendix C

Index of Quotations

श्रीभाष्ये प्रसङ्गादुद्धृतानां श्रुतिस्मृतिसूत्रपुराणादिवाक्यानां वर्णानुक्रमेण सूचीपत्रम्।

[(१) प्रथमो भागः (पृ. १-२४७) (२) द्वितीयो भागः (पृ. २४८-७०६)
(३) तृतीयो भागः (पृ. ७०७-१०६१)]

पृष्ठम्

पृष्ठम्

ध

न

प

५

Appendix D

Index of Important Names, Topics, Works, Words, etc, dealt with in the Introduction and Notes

[Introduction — Pp XIV-XXXVI (Part I)
Notes — Pp. 1-80 (Part I)
— Pp, 81-168 (Part II)
— Pp. 169-263 (Part III)].

Ap

Index of Important Names, To

the Introc

[Introduction —]

Notes —]

—

—

Pa

ERRATA

Pages 333 ... 363 of the Notes should be corrected as 233 ... 263
Ś often appears as S (owing to the defective type).
Other mistakes can easily be detected by the reader.
